



COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES 2002

**Department of
Health Services and
California
Conference of Local
Health Officers**

Public Health Week: April 1-7, 2002

COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES 2002

Health Information and Strategic Planning
George B. (Peter) Abbott, M.D., M.P.H.
Deputy Director

Center for Health Statistics
Michael L. Rodrian, Chief

Office of Health Information and Research
Michael Quinn, Chief

Planning and Data Analysis Section
Karen Flannigan, Chief

In collaboration with
California Conference of Local Health Officers
Poki Stewart Namkung, M.D., M.P.H.
President

Gray Davis
Governor
State of California

Grantland Johnson
Secretary
California Health & Human Services Agency

Diana M. Bontá, R.N., Dr. P.H.
Director
Department of Health Services

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by **Cynthia Schmidt**, Research Program Specialist, with the Center for Health Statistics, Planning and Data Analysis Section. The principal author would like to extend her appreciation to the following people for their assistance in the preparation of this report:

Janet Ciarcia (Office of Health Information and Research) composed the formulas within the technical notes and coordinated the mass mailing of this report.

Michael Curtis (Maternal and Child Health Branch) provided breastfeeding initiation data.

Denise Gilson (Division of Communicable Disease Control) provided syphilis and chlamydia case incidence data.

Mary Heim (Department of Finance) provided the 1990 census data and the 1998 and 1999 race/ethnic population estimates by county with age and sex detail, October and May 2000.

Sharon Ito (Office of AIDS) provided AIDS case incidence data.

Shu Sebesta (Division of Communicable Disease Control) provided hepatitis C case incidence data.

Rina Shaikh (Division of Communicable Disease Control) provided measles case incidence data.

Mich Tashiro (Office of Health Information and Research) matched the birth and infant death records from the separate Birth and Death Statistical Master Files to create the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files of linked births and deaths.

Janice Westenhouse (Tuberculosis Control Program) provided tuberculosis case incidence data.

The Staff of the Office of Vital Records collected, coded, and edited birth and death certificates, which form the basis of the Birth and Death Statistical Master Files.

Cover Photography by **Penelope Cook**: Death Valley

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

714/744 P STREET
P.O. BOX 942732
SACRAMENTO, CA 94234-7320
(916) 657-1425



Dear Colleague:

We are pleased to present the tenth edition of **County Health Status Profiles** for Public Health Week, April 1-7, 2002. This report contains selected health status indicators recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service for monitoring state and local progress toward achieving some of the goals set forth in **Healthy People 2010**. The Year 2010 National Health Objectives challenge public health professionals to increase the span of healthy life, reduce health disparities, and ensure access to preventive services for all Americans.

The **Profiles** report is evaluated with each annual edition and amended according to priorities developed by the Department of Health Services and the California Conference of Local Health Officers. Data for Chlamydia and Hepatitis C were added last year, as they have emerged as public health concerns. However, the basic set of health indicators from year-to-year has remained relatively unchanged.

We believe this report represents an important means to assess public health in California. The health status indicators are based on data that are readily available for providing information to guide the future course of health promotion and preventive services.

Diana M. Bontá, R.N., Dr. P.H.
Director
California Department of Health Services

Poki Stewart Namkung, M.D, M.P.H
President
California Conference of Local Health Officers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1- 2
--------------------	------

TABLES WITH HIGHLIGHTS	3-62
------------------------------	------

TABLES

HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS

1 – 13	MORTALITY INDICATORS PER 100,000 POPULATION
1	All Causes of Death 3-4
2	Motor Vehicle Crashes 5-6
3	Unintentional Injuries 7-8
4	Firearm Injuries..... 9 -10
5	Homicide..... 11-12
6	Suicide 13-14
7	All Cancer Deaths..... 15-16
8	Lung Cancer 17-18
9	Female Breast Cancer..... 19-20
10	Coronary Heart Disease 21-22
11	Cerebrovascular Disease (Stroke) 23-24
12	Drug-Related Deaths 25-26
13	Diabetes..... 27-28
14 – 19	MORBIDITY INDICATORS PER 100,000 POPULATION
14	Hepatitis C 29-30
15	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) 31-32
16	Tuberculosis 33-34
17	Chlamydia..... 35-36
18	Syphilis..... 37
19	Measles 38
20A – 20E	BIRTH COHORT INFANT MORTALITY UNDER ONE YEAR OF AGE PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS
20A	All Race/Ethnic Groups Infant Mortality 39-40
20B	Asian/Other Race Group Infant Mortality..... 41-42
20C	Black Race Group Infant Mortality 43-44
20D	Hispanic Ethnic Group Infant Mortality 45-46
20E	White Race Group Infant Mortality 47-48
21 – 23B	NATALITY INDICATORS PER 100 LIVE BIRTHS OR 1,000 POPULATION
21	Low Birthweight Infants..... 49-50
22	Births to Adolescent Mothers, 15-19 Years Old Per 1,000 Live Births 51-52
23A	Prenatal Care Not Begun During The First Trimester 53-54
23B	Adequate/Adequate Plus Prenatal Care (APNCU Index) 55-56
	BREASTFEEDING INITIATION RATES PER 100 LIVE BIRTHS
24	Breastfeeding Initiation During Early Postpartum 57-58

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLES

HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS

1990 CENSUS POPULATION HEALTH INDICATOR

25	Persons Under 18 Below Poverty.....	59-60
----	-------------------------------------	-------

A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE DATA

26	A comparison of three-year average data among selected indicators	61-62
----	---	-------

TECHNICAL NOTES.....	63-74
----------------------	-------

Comparison of 1940 and 2000 Standard Population Age-Adjusted Rates (Appendix A)	74
--	----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	75
--------------------	----

ORDER FORMS	76-78
-------------------	-------

INTRODUCTION

County Health Status Profiles has been presented annually for the State of California since 1993. The purpose of this report is to present public health data that can be directly compared with clearly established benchmarks, such as national standards, and populations of similar composition.

In keeping with the goal of using national standards, two major changes were implemented last year in the 2001 report:

- Mortality cause of death data has been coded using the *International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision* (reports prior to 2001 used the *International Classification of Diseases, 9th Revision*).
- Age-adjusted rates use the 2000 Standard Population (reports prior to 2001 used the 1940 Standard Population).

The impact of these changes is discussed in the Technical Notes section of this report.

This report presents vital statistics and morbidity tables that show the population, number of events, percentages, crude rates, and age-adjusted death rates by county. Also shown on these tables are the upper and lower 95% confidence limits, which provide a means for assessing the degree of stability of the estimated rates and percentages. Vital statistics rates and percentages are also subject to random variation, which is inversely related to the number of events (e.g., deaths) used to calculate the rates and percentages. Therefore, standard errors and relative standard errors (coefficients of variation) are calculated to measure the reliability of the rates and percentages. Estimated rates and percentages that are categorized as unreliable (relative standard error $\geq 23\%$) are marked on these tables with an asterisk (*). The counties on these tables are ranked by the rates or percentages, regardless of their reliability, in ascending order. Those with identical rates or percentages are ranked next by the county's population size in descending order.

The "Highlights" and the explanatory "Notes" are adjacent to each of the tables. The explanatory "Notes" as well as the "Technical Notes" are provided to assist the readers with information on data limitations and qualifications for correctly interpreting and comparing these data among the counties. For those who may want to learn more about the problems associated with analysis of vital events involving small numbers, small area analysis, and age-adjusted death rates, references to relevant statistical publications are located in the Bibliography.

Data for this report have been provided by the California Department of Health Services' Center for Health Statistics, Division of Communicable Disease Control, Genetic Disease Branch, and the Office of AIDS. In addition, the Demographic Research Unit and the Census Data Center of the Department of Finance provided the 1990 census data and the 1998 and 1999 race/ethnic population estimates by county with age and sex detail, October and May 2000, respectively.

You may access this report online at the California Department of Health Services web

page. The web page address for the index of publications where this report will be listed is:
www.dhs.ca.gov/hisp/chs/OHIR/publicationindex.htm.

If you have questions about this report, or desire additional state or county health status data and statistics (either hard copy reports or electronic media), please write or phone:

California Department of Health Services
Center for Health Statistics
304 S Street, Third Floor
P. O. Box 730241
Sacramento, CA 94244-0241
Telephone (916) 445-6355

Should you wish additional copies of *County Health Status Profiles*, instructions for placing your order appear on page 76 this report.

TABLE 1: DEATHS DUE TO ALL CAUSES, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from all causes for California was 666.9 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 150 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 227,232.0 from 1998 to 2000, and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 1,277.7 in Lake County to 366.6 in Mono County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from all causes for California for the three-year period from 1998 to 2000 was 773.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 1,045.2 in Yuba County to 636.1 in San Benito County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population (the "standard population").

A Year 2010 National Objective for deaths due to all causes has not been established.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1998-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Estimates with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 1
DEATHS DUE TO ALL CAUSES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1998-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
	YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED						
1	MONO	10,730	39.3	366.6	474.7 *	191.3	758.1
2	SIERRA	3,427	34.3	1,001.8	624.4 *	249.5	999.4
3	SAN BENITO	50,087	275.3	549.7	636.1	490.1	782.0
4	LASSEN	35,208	200.0	568.1	648.6	482.3	815.0
5	NEVADA	94,014	860.7	915.5	655.5	569.1	742.0
6	ALPINE	1,226	7.0	571.0 *	657.2 *	0.0	1578.7
7	SAN MATEO	735,381	4,873.3	662.7	662.5	625.5	699.5
8	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	1,663.7	650.3	692.5	628.0	756.9
9	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	8,937.3	516.0	696.9	665.2	728.5
10	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	6,587.3	834.9	698.4	667.9	728.9
11	IMPERIAL	150,381	849.7	565.0	699.6	613.2	786.0
12	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	1,997.3	805.8	709.9	650.9	768.9
13	AMADOR	34,410	355.3	1,032.6	716.9	575.3	858.4
14	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	2,913.3	713.5	717.2	667.2	767.3
15	CALAVERAS	40,597	394.0	970.5	724.0	586.9	861.0
16	EL DORADO	156,996	1,109.3	706.6	724.7	636.0	813.5
17	COLUSA	20,091	146.0	726.7	725.4	518.6	932.2
18	MARIN	247,073	1,827.0	739.5	727.6	657.5	797.8
19	INYO	18,348	198.3	1,081.0	734.3	545.0	923.6
20	MARIPOSA	16,339	170.3	1,042.5	736.6	542.9	930.2
21	MONTEREY	395,133	2,336.0	591.2	737.7	678.4	796.9
22	PLUMAS	20,714	211.0	1,018.6	743.4	553.0	933.7
23	MODOC	10,384	104.3	1,004.8	750.6	477.9	1023.3
24	VENTURA	744,825	4,643.3	623.4	755.7	711.7	799.7
25	MADERA	121,779	854.7	701.8	755.9	660.0	851.8
26	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	59,189.7	608.5	769.1	756.9	781.3
27	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	19,185.3	665.1	769.3	748.2	790.5
28	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	6,625.3	718.8	769.8	732.3	807.3
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	227,232.0	666.9	773.8	767.6	780.1
29	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	11,948.7	786.4	776.2	750.1	802.3
30	DEL NORTE	30,358	255.0	840.0	776.2	614.4	938.1
31	SONOMA	450,187	3,753.3	833.7	777.8	730.2	825.4
32	BUTTE	204,216	2,130.3	1,043.2	779.7	719.7	839.7
33	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	9,835.0	678.9	785.5	755.2	815.7
34	ORANGE	2,787,593	16,432.3	589.5	785.8	760.4	811.2
35	NAPA	125,123	1,264.0	1,010.2	788.9	706.9	870.8
36	TUOLUMNE	54,631	565.3	1,034.8	791.2	663.6	918.8
37	PLACER	233,836	1,783.0	762.5	795.0	721.1	868.8
38	GLENN	28,438	239.7	842.8	798.6	617.4	979.8
39	SUTTER	79,992	658.0	822.6	807.7	694.5	920.9
40	YOLO	160,805	1,046.3	650.7	811.9	716.9	907.0
41	FRESNO	800,121	5,414.0	676.6	814.6	773.4	855.9
42	SISKIYOU	44,847	465.3	1,037.6	817.3	675.5	959.1
43	TULARE	371,640	2,579.7	694.1	818.8	760.3	877.3
44	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	4,245.0	749.0	818.8	773.4	864.3
45	KERN	662,472	4,633.3	699.4	836.0	791.3	880.8
46	MENDOCINO	88,978	798.0	896.9	839.6	728.5	950.7
47	MERCED	210,707	1,352.0	641.6	852.2	762.2	942.3
48	LAKE	58,335	745.3	1,277.7	856.5	749.5	963.5
49	TEHAMA	55,806	606.3	1,086.5	863.6	737.8	989.5
50	SOLANO	392,201	2,431.7	620.0	866.7	793.8	939.6
51	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	8,925.0	750.6	867.0	831.0	903.0
52	KINGS	123,683	718.7	581.1	873.3	750.6	996.0
53	STANISLAUS	446,056	3,380.3	757.8	880.0	823.7	936.4
54	SHASTA	171,211	1,681.0	981.8	887.4	805.8	969.0
55	TRINITY	13,353	144.7	1,083.4	896.1	614.8	1177.5
56	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	10,889.3	644.7	906.4	872.4	940.4
57	HUMBOLDT	127,658	1,179.3	923.8	925.7	826.9	1024.5
58	YUBA	63,062	543.3	861.6	1,045.2	884.6	1205.8

TABLE 2: DEATHS DUE TO MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from motor vehicle crashes for California was 9.4 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 10,600 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths of 3,214.5 from 1999 to 2000 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 20.2 in Merced County to 5.3 in Santa Barbara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from motor vehicle crashes for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 9.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 21.6 in Merced County to 5.3 in Santa Barbara County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 24 counties (12 with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 9.2 age-adjusted deaths due to motor vehicle crashes per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

**TABLE 2
DEATHS DUE TO MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MODOC	10,384	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	3,427	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
3	ALPINE	1,226	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
4	LASSEN	35,208	1.0	2.8 *	3.1 *	0.0	9.1
5	MARIN	247,073	13.0	5.3 *	5.1 *	2.3	7.8
6	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	21.5	5.3	5.3	3.0	7.5
7	COLUSA	20,091	1.0	5.0 *	5.4 *	0.0	16.0
8	SAN MATEO	735,381	41.0	5.6	5.6	3.9	7.4
9	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	15.0	5.9 *	6.0 *	2.9	9.0
10	INYO	18,348	1.0	5.5 *	6.0 *	0.0	17.8
11	PLACER	233,836	15.0	6.4 *	6.5 *	3.2	9.8
12	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	54.5	6.9	6.8	4.9	8.6
13	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	62.5	6.8	7.0	5.2	8.7
14	DEL NORTE	30,358	2.5	8.2 *	7.2 *	0.0	16.2
15	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	108.0	7.5	7.7	6.2	9.1
16	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	123.5	7.1	7.7	6.3	9.0
17	ORANGE	2,787,593	203.0	7.3	7.7	6.7	8.8
18	YOLO	160,805	11.5	7.2 *	7.8 *	3.1	12.4
19	NEVADA	94,014	8.0	8.5 *	7.8 *	2.2	13.4
20	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	228.0	7.9	8.1	7.0	9.1
21	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	98.0	8.2	8.5	6.8	10.2
22	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	781.0	8.0	8.6	8.0	9.2
23	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	23.5	9.5	9.1	5.4	12.9
24	MONTEREY	395,133	33.0	8.4	9.1	6.0	12.3
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					9.2		
25	SOLANO	392,201	35.5	9.1	9.4	6.3	12.5
26	MENDOCINO	88,978	8.5	9.6 *	9.5 *	3.1	15.9
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	3,214.5	9.4	9.8	9.4	10.1
27	EL DORADO	156,996	15.5	9.9 *	10.0 *	5.0	15.0
28	SONOMA	450,187	44.5	9.9	10.0	7.1	13.0
29	VENTURA	744,825	74.0	9.9	10.2	7.9	12.5
30	NAPA	125,123	14.0	11.2 *	10.9 *	5.1	16.7
31	BUTTE	204,216	24.0	11.8	11.7	7.0	16.5
32	SHASTA	171,211	21.5	12.6	12.4	7.1	17.7
33	SUTTER	79,992	10.0	12.5 *	12.9 *	4.9	21.0
34	SAN BENITO	50,087	6.5	13.0 *	13.4 *	3.0	23.8
35	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	200.0	13.2	13.5	11.6	15.3
36	HUMBOLDT	127,658	18.0	14.1 *	13.7 *	7.3	20.0
37	AMADOR	34,410	5.5	16.0 *	13.9 *	1.8	25.9
38	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	224.5	13.3	14.2	12.3	16.1
39	LAKE	58,335	9.0	15.4 *	14.5 *	4.6	24.3
40	STANISLAUS	446,056	63.5	14.2	14.9	11.2	18.6
41	TUOLUMNE	54,631	8.5	15.6 *	15.1 *	4.8	25.4
42	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	86.5	15.3	15.6	12.3	18.9
43	IMPERIAL	150,381	21.5	14.3	16.1	9.1	23.1
44	KERN	662,472	102.0	15.4	16.1	13.0	19.3
45	SISKIYOU	44,847	8.5	19.0 *	17.6 *	5.5	29.7
46	KINGS	123,683	19.5	15.8	17.7 *	9.6	25.7
47	MADERA	121,779	22.0	18.1	17.8	10.3	25.3
48	TULARE	371,640	65.5	17.6	18.1	13.7	22.6
49	GLENN	28,438	5.5	19.3 *	20.1 *	3.2	37.1
50	TRINITY	13,353	3.0	22.5 *	20.4 *	0.0	44.1
51	YUBA	63,062	12.0	19.0 *	20.4 *	8.7	32.0
52	MARIPOSA	16,339	3.5	21.4 *	20.6 *	0.0	42.9
53	FRESNO	800,121	160.0	20.0	21.0	17.7	24.3
54	MERCED	210,707	42.5	20.2	21.6	14.9	28.2
55	TEHAMA	55,806	13.0	23.3 *	22.1 *	9.8	34.3
56	PLUMAS	20,714	5.5	26.6 *	24.9 *	3.2	46.6
57	MONO	10,730	3.0	28.0 *	30.2 *	0.0	66.0
58	CALAVERAS	40,597	12.5	30.8 *	30.8 *	13.0	48.6

TABLE 3: DEATHS DUE TO UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from unintentional injuries for California was 26.1 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 3,838 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths of 8,877.0 from 1999 to 2000 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 62.6 in Lake County to 18.0 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from unintentional injuries for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 27.4 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 61.4 in Yuba County to 19.9 in Santa Clara County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 2 counties (none with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 17.5 age-adjusted deaths due to unintentional injuries per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 3
DEATHS DUE TO UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,226	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	LASSEN	35,208	4.5	12.8 *	14.4 *	1.1	27.7
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					17.5		
3	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	311.5	18.0	19.9	17.6	22.2
4	SAN MATEO	735,381	149.5	20.3	20.2	17.0	23.5
5	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	1,994.0	20.5	22.0	21.1	23.0
6	INYO	18,348	4.5	24.5 *	22.3 *	1.2	43.4
7	MARIN	247,073	56.5	22.9	22.5	16.5	28.4
8	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	207.0	22.5	23.0	19.9	26.2
9	ORANGE	2,787,593	586.0	21.0	23.3	21.4	25.3
10	SIERRA	3,427	1.0	29.2 *	24.0 *	0.0	71.1
11	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	340.0	23.5	24.4	21.8	27.0
12	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	62.0	24.2	24.6	18.4	30.8
13	COLUSA	20,091	5.0	24.9 *	25.9 *	3.1	48.8
14	SOLANO	392,201	91.5	23.3	26.7	21.1	32.4
15	PLACER	233,836	63.0	26.9	27.4	20.6	34.1
16	YOLO	160,805	39.0	24.3	27.4	18.6	36.2
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	8,877.0	26.1	27.4	26.8	27.9
17	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	741.0	25.7	27.5	25.5	29.5
18	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	313.0	26.3	27.9	24.8	31.0
19	MODOC	10,384	3.0	28.9 *	28.1 *	0.0	60.5
20	MONTEREY	395,133	101.5	25.7	28.5	22.9	34.1
21	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	430.0	25.5	28.7	25.9	31.4
22	SONOMA	450,187	135.5	30.1	29.3	24.4	34.3
23	SAN BENITO	50,087	14.0	28.0 *	30.2 *	14.3	46.1
24	NAPA	125,123	40.5	32.4	30.2	20.8	39.7
25	VENTURA	744,825	209.5	28.1	30.2	26.1	34.4
26	NEVADA	94,014	31.0	33.0	30.4	19.3	41.4
27	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	281.5	35.7	32.7	28.8	36.6
28	AMADOR	34,410	13.5	39.2 *	32.9 *	14.5	51.2
29	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	136.0	33.3	33.0	27.4	38.5
30	EL DORADO	156,996	50.5	32.2	33.0	23.8	42.2
31	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	493.0	32.4	33.2	30.2	36.1
32	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	83.5	33.7	33.6	26.2	41.0
33	GLENN	28,438	10.5	36.9 *	36.9 *	14.4	59.4
34	DEL NORTE	30,358	11.5	37.9 *	36.9 *	15.4	58.4
35	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	209.5	37.0	38.3	33.1	43.5
36	MADERA	121,779	45.0	37.0	38.6	27.3	50.0
37	FRESNO	800,121	290.5	36.3	39.0	34.5	43.6
38	BUTTE	204,216	84.0	41.1	39.2	30.6	47.7
39	MENDOCINO	88,978	35.5	39.9	39.8	26.6	53.0
40	KINGS	123,683	42.5	34.4	40.2	27.7	52.7
41	STANISLAUS	446,056	170.5	38.2	40.6	34.4	46.7
42	TUOLUMNE	54,631	24.0	43.9	40.6	24.0	57.2
43	KERN	662,472	256.5	38.7	41.4	36.3	46.5
44	IMPERIAL	150,381	72.5	48.2	44.5	32.8	56.1
45	MERCED	210,707	83.0	39.4	44.5	34.7	54.3
46	SISKIYOU	44,847	23.0	51.3	46.1	26.8	65.4
47	SUTTER	79,992	37.5	46.9	47.4	32.2	62.6
48	MONO	10,730	5.0	46.6 *	47.8 *	4.2	91.4
49	TULARE	371,640	172.5	46.4	49.5	42.0	57.0
50	PLUMAS	20,714	11.0	53.1 *	49.7 *	18.9	80.5
51	SHASTA	171,211	87.0	50.8	50.5	39.9	61.2
52	TEHAMA	55,806	30.5	54.7	50.9	32.4	69.4
53	HUMBOLDT	127,658	66.5	52.1	51.2	38.8	63.5
54	CALAVERAS	40,597	24.0	59.1	56.5	33.0	80.0
55	LAKE	58,335	36.5	62.6	60.7	40.2	81.3
56	YUBA	63,062	35.0	55.5	61.4	40.9	81.9
57	MARIPOSA	16,339	11.5	70.4 *	64.1 *	25.2	102.9
58	TRINITY	13,353	9.5	71.1 *	69.0 *	24.1	113.9

TABLE 4: DEATHS DUE TO FIREARM INJURIES, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from firearm injuries for California was 9.0 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 11,158 persons. This rate was based on the two-year average number of deaths from 1999 to 2000 of 3,053.5 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 14.9 in Shasta County to 4.2 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from firearm injuries for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 9.3 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 14.9 in Shasta County to 4.4 in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 4 counties (none with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 4.1 age-adjusted deaths due to firearm-related injuries per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 4
DEATHS DUE TO FIREARM INJURIES
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,226	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	SAN BENITO	50,087	1.0	2.0 *	2.0 *	0.0	6.1
3	MARIN	247,073	8.5	3.4 *	3.4 *	1.1	5.6
4	KINGS	123,683	4.0	3.2 *	3.6 *	0.0	7.3
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					4.1		
5	SAN MATEO	735,381	33.0	4.5	4.4	2.9	6.0
6	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	72.5	4.2	4.4	3.4	5.5
7	MARIPOSA	16,339	1.0	6.1 *	4.8 *	0.0	14.4
8	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	15.0	6.1 *	5.8 *	2.8	8.8
9	NAPA	125,123	7.5	6.0 *	6.0 *	1.7	10.3
10	ORANGE	2,787,593	156.0	5.6	6.1	5.1	7.0
11	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	24.5	6.0	6.2	3.7	8.6
12	DEL NORTE	30,358	2.0	6.6 *	6.4 *	0.0	15.2
13	SONOMA	450,187	29.0	6.4	6.4	4.1	8.8
14	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	48.5	6.1	6.5	4.6	8.4
15	IMPERIAL	150,381	9.0	6.0 *	6.6 *	2.1	11.0
16	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	17.5	6.8 *	7.0 *	3.7	10.3
17	VENTURA	744,825	49.5	6.6	7.1	5.1	9.1
18	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	199.5	6.9	7.3	6.3	8.4
19	INYO	18,348	1.5	8.2 *	7.4 *	0.0	19.5
20	STANISLAUS	446,056	32.5	7.3	7.6	4.9	10.2
21	SUTTER	79,992	6.0	7.5 *	7.7 *	1.5	13.9
22	PLUMAS	20,714	2.0	9.7 *	8.0 *	0.0	19.6
23	PLACER	233,836	19.0	8.1	8.2 *	4.5	11.9
24	MONTEREY	395,133	32.5	8.2	8.5	5.5	11.4
25	SOLANO	392,201	31.5	8.0	8.7	5.6	11.8
26	MONO	10,730	1.0	9.3 *	8.8 *	0.0	26.1
27	FRESNO	800,121	65.5	8.2	8.8	6.7	11.0
28	MADERA	121,779	10.0	8.2 *	9.0 *	3.4	14.6
29	MERCED	210,707	18.0	8.5 *	9.0 *	4.8	13.3
30	TULARE	371,640	32.5	8.7	9.1	5.9	12.2
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	3,053.5	9.0	9.3	8.9	9.6
31	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	133.5	9.2	9.4	7.8	11.0
32	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	52.5	9.3	9.6	7.0	12.2
33	YOLO	160,805	14.0	8.7 *	9.7 *	4.5	14.9
34	EL DORADO	156,996	15.0	9.6 *	9.7 *	4.8	14.7
35	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	88.5	9.6	9.8	7.8	11.9
36	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	115.5	9.7	10.0	8.2	11.8
37	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	149.5	9.8	10.1	8.5	11.7
38	BUTTE	204,216	22.5	11.0	10.3	6.0	14.7
39	TUOLUMNE	54,631	6.5	11.9 *	10.3 *	2.2	18.4
40	LAKE	58,335	8.0	13.7 *	10.6 *	2.8	18.3
41	KERN	662,472	67.5	10.2	10.8	8.2	13.4
42	TEHAMA	55,806	6.5	11.6 *	11.8 *	2.6	21.0
43	MODOC	10,384	1.5	14.4 *	12.0 *	0.0	31.4
44	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	1,114.5	11.5	12.1	11.4	12.8
45	NEVADA	94,014	13.0	13.8 *	12.2 *	5.2	19.2
46	SISKIYOU	44,847	6.0	13.4 *	12.6 *	2.2	23.0
47	MENDOCINO	88,978	11.5	12.9 *	13.0 *	5.4	20.5
48	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	210.5	12.5	13.5	11.6	15.4
49	HUMBOLDT	127,658	18.5	14.5 *	14.4 *	7.8	21.0
50	SHASTA	171,211	25.5	14.9	14.9	9.1	20.7
51	LASSEN	35,208	5.0	14.2 *	15.0 *	1.7	28.3
52	YUBA	63,062	8.5	13.5 *	15.6 *	5.0	26.1
53	GLENN	28,438	5.0	17.6 *	17.9 *	2.1	33.6
54	TRINITY	13,353	3.0	22.5 *	18.1 *	0.0	38.6
55	CALAVERAS	40,597	8.0	19.7 *	19.7 *	5.7	33.7
56	AMADOR	34,410	8.0	23.2 *	21.2 *	6.1	36.4
57	COLUSA	20,091	4.5	22.4 *	23.6 *	1.6	45.5
58	SIERRA	3,427	1.0	29.2 *	34.9 *	0.0	103.3

TABLE 5: DEATHS DUE TO HOMICIDE, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from homicide for California was 6.1 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 16,516 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths from 1999 to 2000 of 2,063.0 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 9.7 in Los Angeles County to 2.4 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from homicide for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 6.1 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 9.9 in Los Angeles County to 2.3 in Santa Clara County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 22 counties (2 with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 3.0 age-adjusted deaths due to homicide per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 5
DEATHS DUE TO HOMICIDE
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	PLUMAS	20,714	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	INYO	18,348	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
3	MODOC	10,384	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
4	ALPINE	1,226	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
5	SISKIYOU	44,847	0.5	1.1 *	1.0 *	0.0	3.7
6	MARIN	247,073	3.5	1.4 *	1.6 *	0.0	3.3
7	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	4.0	1.6 *	1.7 *	0.0	3.4
8	KINGS	123,683	2.5	2.0 *	1.9 *	0.0	4.4
9	PLACER	233,836	4.5	1.9 *	1.9 *	0.1	3.8
10	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	9.0	2.2 *	2.2 *	0.8	3.6
11	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	41.0	2.4	2.3	1.6	3.0
12	SONOMA	450,187	10.5	2.3 *	2.4 *	0.9	3.8
13	SAN MATEO	735,381	18.0	2.4 *	2.5 *	1.3	3.7
14	EL DORADO	156,996	4.0	2.5 *	2.6 *	0.0	5.2
15	SUTTER	79,992	2.0	2.5 *	2.7 *	0.0	6.5
16	SAN BENITO	50,087	1.5	3.0 *	2.8 *	0.0	7.3
17	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	7.0	2.7 *	2.8 *	0.7	4.9
18	TUOLUMNE	54,631	1.5	2.7 *	2.8 *	0.0	7.3
19	NAPA	125,123	3.5	2.8 *	2.9 *	0.0	5.9
20	ORANGE	2,787,593	78.0	2.8	2.9	2.2	3.5
21	GLENN	28,438	1.0	3.5 *	3.0 *	0.0	8.9
22	BUTTE	204,216	6.0	2.9 *	3.0 *	0.6	5.4
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					3.0		
23	YOLO	160,805	5.5	3.4 *	3.2 *	0.3	6.2
24	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	98.5	3.4	3.3	2.7	4.0
25	IMPERIAL	150,381	5.0	3.3 *	3.4 *	0.3	6.4
26	LAKE	58,335	2.5	4.3 *	3.4 *	0.0	7.9
27	VENTURA	744,825	26.5	3.6	3.6	2.2	4.9
28	MONO	10,730	0.5	4.7 *	3.7 *	0.0	14.0
29	CALAVERAS	40,597	1.5	3.7 *	3.8 *	0.0	9.8
30	NEVADA	94,014	3.5	3.7 *	3.9 *	0.0	8.1
31	AMADOR	34,410	1.5	4.4 *	4.0 *	0.0	10.5
32	MARIPOSA	16,339	0.5	3.1 *	4.2 *	0.0	15.8
33	TEHAMA	55,806	2.0	3.6 *	4.2 *	0.0	10.1
34	STANISLAUS	446,056	19.0	4.3	4.3 *	2.3	6.2
35	YUBA	63,062	2.5	4.0 *	4.3 *	0.0	9.6
36	LASSEN	35,208	1.5	4.3 *	4.6 *	0.0	11.9
37	SHASTA	171,211	8.0	4.7 *	4.8 *	1.5	8.1
38	TULARE	371,640	19.0	5.1	4.8 *	2.6	7.1
39	FRESNO	800,121	39.5	4.9	4.9	3.3	6.4
40	HUMBOLDT	127,658	7.0	5.5 *	5.4 *	1.4	9.4
41	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	81.0	5.3	5.5	4.3	6.7
42	SOLANO	392,201	23.0	5.9	5.7	3.4	8.0
43	MERCED	210,707	12.5	5.9 *	5.8 *	2.5	9.0
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	2,063.0	6.1	6.1	5.8	6.3
44	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	73.5	6.2	6.2	4.8	7.6
45	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	60.0	6.5	6.8	5.0	8.5
46	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	50.5	6.4	6.8	4.9	8.8
47	MENDOCINO	88,978	5.5	6.2 *	6.8 *	1.1	12.6
48	MADERA	121,779	8.0	6.6 *	6.8 *	2.1	11.6
49	MONTEREY	395,133	27.5	7.0	6.9	4.3	9.5
50	DEL NORTE	30,358	2.0	6.6 *	7.0 *	0.0	16.7
51	KERN	662,472	47.5	7.2	7.1	5.1	9.2
52	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	41.0	7.2	7.3	5.0	9.5
53	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	109.5	7.6	7.6	6.2	9.0
54	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	130.5	7.7	7.8	6.5	9.2
55	TRINITY	13,353	1.5	11.2 *	8.7 *	0.0	22.5
56	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	944.0	9.7	9.9	9.3	10.6
57	COLUSA	20,091	3.0	14.9 *	14.4 *	0.0	30.8
58	SIERRA	3,427	0.5	14.6 *	17.4 *	0.0	65.8

TABLE 6: DEATHS DUE TO SUICIDE, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from suicide for California was 9.0 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 11,062 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths from 1999 to 2000 of 3,080.0 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 18.4 in Shasta County to 6.3 in Monterey County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.9 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from suicide for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 9.5 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 18.4 in Shasta County to 6.8 in Monterey County. The difference between the crude rate and the age-adjusted rate shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 3 counties (none with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 5.0 age-adjusted deaths due to suicide per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 6
DEATHS DUE TO SUICIDE
RANKED TWO-YEAR AVERAGE BY AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	10,730	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	ALPINE	1,226	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
3	SAN BENITO	50,087	1.0	2.0 *	2.2 *	0.0	6.6
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					5.0		
4	NAPA	125,123	7.5	6.0 *	5.7 *	1.6	9.8
5	MONTEREY	395,133	25.0	6.3	6.8	4.1	9.5
6	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	122.5	7.1	7.3	6.0	8.6
7	SAN MATEO	735,381	58.5	8.0	7.8	5.8	9.8
8	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	111.0	7.7	7.8	6.4	9.3
9	MADERA	121,779	9.0	7.4 *	8.0 *	2.7	13.3
10	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	721.5	7.4	8.0	7.4	8.6
11	MARIPOSA	16,339	1.5	9.2 *	8.2 *	0.0	21.8
12	FRESNO	800,121	61.0	7.6	8.5	6.4	10.7
13	ORANGE	2,787,593	222.5	8.0	8.5	7.4	9.7
14	STANISLAUS	446,056	36.0	8.1	8.6	5.8	11.4
15	TRINITY	13,353	1.5	11.2 *	8.7 *	0.0	22.5
16	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	79.0	8.6	8.7	6.8	10.6
17	VENTURA	744,825	62.5	8.4	9.1	6.8	11.4
18	IMPERIAL	150,381	12.5	8.3 *	9.3 *	4.0	14.6
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	3,080.0	9.0	9.5	9.2	9.8
19	KINGS	123,683	10.5	8.5 *	9.6 *	3.6	15.7
20	TULARE	371,640	32.0	8.6	9.7	6.3	13.0
21	MERCED	210,707	18.0	8.5 *	9.7 *	5.1	14.2
22	SOLANO	392,201	35.5	9.1	9.9	6.6	13.3
23	PLACER	233,836	23.5	10.0	10.3	6.1	14.5
24	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	88.0	11.2	10.4	8.2	12.6
25	MARIN	247,073	27.5	11.1	10.4	6.5	14.4
26	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	56.5	10.0	10.5	7.8	13.3
27	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	42.5	10.4	10.8	7.6	14.1
28	SONOMA	450,187	50.5	11.2	10.9	7.9	13.9
29	KERN	662,472	65.0	9.8	10.9	8.3	13.6
30	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	162.5	10.7	11.1	9.4	12.8
31	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	28.5	11.5	11.3	7.1	15.6
32	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	131.5	11.1	11.4	9.5	13.4
33	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	171.5	10.2	11.5	9.7	13.2
34	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	309.5	10.7	11.7	10.4	13.0
35	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	30.5	11.9	11.8	7.6	16.0
36	EL DORADO	156,996	20.0	12.7	12.9	7.2	18.5
37	SUTTER	79,992	10.0	12.5 *	12.9 *	4.9	20.9
38	TUOLUMNE	54,631	8.0	14.6 *	13.0 *	3.9	22.2
39	DEL NORTE	30,358	4.0	13.2 *	13.4 *	0.2	26.5
40	YOLO	160,805	19.5	12.1	13.5 *	7.4	19.7
41	COLUSA	20,091	2.5	12.4 *	13.8 *	0.0	31.1
42	INYO	18,348	2.5	13.6 *	13.8 *	0.0	31.4
43	LAKE	58,335	10.5	18.0 *	15.2 *	5.5	24.9
44	PLUMAS	20,714	3.5	16.9 *	15.4 *	0.0	32.5
45	LASSEN	35,208	5.5	15.6 *	16.2 *	2.4	30.1
46	BUTTE	204,216	35.0	17.1	16.8	11.2	22.5
47	HUMBOLDT	127,658	22.0	17.2	17.1	9.9	24.2
48	SIERRA	3,427	0.5	14.6 *	17.4 *	0.0	65.8
49	NEVADA	94,014	17.5	18.6 *	17.7 *	8.9	26.5
50	SHASTA	171,211	31.5	18.4	18.4	11.9	24.8
51	MENDOCINO	88,978	17.0	19.1 *	18.6 *	9.7	27.5
52	TEHAMA	55,806	10.0	17.9 *	18.9 *	7.0	30.8
53	YUBA	63,062	10.0	15.9 *	19.0 *	7.2	30.8
54	GLENN	28,438	5.5	19.3 *	19.8 *	3.1	36.4
55	CALAVERAS	40,597	8.0	19.7 *	20.8 *	5.9	35.8
56	SISKIYOU	44,847	10.0	22.3 *	21.5 *	7.8	35.1
57	MODOC	10,384	2.5	24.1 *	22.9 *	0.0	51.6
58	AMADOR	34,410	8.5	24.7 *	23.0 *	7.1	38.9

TABLE 7: DEATHS DUE TO ALL CANCERS, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from all cancers for California was 155.4 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 644 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths from 1999 to 2000 of 52,942.5 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 312.1 in Mariposa County to 109.6 in Kings County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from all cancers for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 179.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 241.0 in Yuba County to 145.3 in Lassen County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 6 counties (4 with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 159.9 age-adjusted deaths due to all cancers per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 7
DEATHS DUE TO ALL CANCERS
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MODOC	10,384	17.0	163.7 *	124.7 *	64.8	184.6
2	MONO	10,730	12.0	111.8 *	132.6 *	54.5	210.7
3	LASSEN	35,208	44.5	126.4	145.3	102.6	188.1
4	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	341.5	133.5	145.6	130.1	161.1
5	SAN BENITO	50,087	68.0	135.8	156.3	119.1	193.6
6	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	2,150.5	124.2	157.7	150.9	164.5
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					159.9		
7	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	637.5	156.1	161.7	149.1	174.2
8	SUTTER	79,992	134.0	167.5	164.6	136.7	192.5
9	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	1,515.5	192.1	165.0	156.7	173.4
10	KINGS	123,683	135.5	109.6	166.8	138.5	195.1
11	IMPERIAL	150,381	194.0	129.0	167.2	143.6	190.8
12	MADERA	121,779	191.0	156.8	170.0	145.8	194.1
13	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	467.0	188.4	170.1	154.5	185.8
14	SAN MATEO	735,381	1,271.5	172.9	170.9	161.5	180.3
15	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	13,355.5	137.3	173.1	170.2	176.1
16	AMADOR	34,410	89.0	258.6	174.2	137.5	210.8
17	TULARE	371,640	534.0	143.7	174.4	159.6	189.2
18	MARIN	247,073	450.5	182.3	175.9	159.6	192.2
19	NEVADA	94,014	238.0	253.2	176.6	153.8	199.4
20	INYO	18,348	45.5	248.0	176.8	124.3	229.3
21	SIERRA	3,427	9.5	277.2 *	177.3 *	63.4	291.2
22	KERN	662,472	971.0	146.6	177.4	166.2	188.6
23	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	1,587.5	172.2	178.5	169.7	187.4
24	FRESNO	800,121	1,163.0	145.4	178.6	168.4	188.9
25	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	2,724.0	179.3	179.2	172.4	186.0
26	MONTEREY	395,133	566.0	143.2	179.2	164.4	194.0
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	52,942.5	155.4	179.8	178.3	181.3
27	DEL NORTE	30,358	59.5	196.0	180.5	134.4	226.7
28	VENTURA	744,825	1,138.5	152.9	180.9	170.3	191.4
29	ORANGE	2,787,593	4,004.5	143.7	183.7	178.0	189.5
30	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	934.0	164.8	184.2	172.4	196.0
31	LAKE	58,335	164.0	281.1	184.5	155.1	213.8
32	CALAVERAS	40,597	108.0	266.0	185.5	150.0	221.0
33	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	2,361.0	163.0	187.7	180.1	195.3
34	EL DORADO	156,996	301.0	191.7	187.8	166.5	209.2
35	NAPA	125,123	287.5	229.8	188.5	166.5	210.5
36	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	4,658.0	161.5	189.5	184.0	195.0
37	BUTTE	204,216	500.5	245.1	189.9	172.8	206.9
38	TUOLUMNE	54,631	139.0	254.4	191.2	158.9	223.5
39	YOLO	160,805	246.5	153.3	192.8	168.6	216.9
40	MERCED	210,707	304.5	144.5	192.8	171.1	214.5
41	SONOMA	450,187	919.0	204.1	194.9	182.3	207.5
42	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	2,370.5	140.4	196.3	188.4	204.3
43	COLUSA	20,091	39.0	194.1	198.0	135.7	260.3
44	SHASTA	171,211	382.5	223.4	198.4	178.5	218.4
45	PLUMAS	20,714	60.0	289.7	198.9	147.6	250.1
46	STANISLAUS	446,056	763.0	171.1	200.3	186.1	214.5
47	MENDOCINO	88,978	195.5	219.7	203.8	175.2	232.4
48	SISKIYOU	44,847	119.0	265.3	203.9	166.7	241.0
49	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	2,141.5	180.1	203.9	195.3	212.6
50	SOLANO	392,201	608.5	155.2	206.3	189.6	223.0
51	MARIPOSA	16,339	51.0	312.1	218.7	157.5	279.9
52	GLENN	28,438	63.5	223.3	218.9	164.8	273.0
53	PLACER	233,836	507.5	217.0	220.3	201.1	239.5
54	HUMBOLDT	127,658	281.0	220.1	221.5	195.6	247.5
55	TEHAMA	55,806	155.5	278.6	224.2	188.4	260.0
56	TRINITY	13,353	39.5	295.8	224.8	154.1	295.5
57	ALPINE	1,226	2.5	203.9 *	235.4 *	0.0	527.7
58	YUBA	63,062	124.0	196.6	241.0	198.5	283.5

TABLE 8: DEATHS DUE TO LUNG CANCER, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked By Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from lung cancer for California was 40.2 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 2,486 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths from 1999 to 2000 of 13,707.5 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 100.3 in Lake County to 25.1 in Kings County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4.0 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from lung cancer for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 46.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 91.5 in Yuba County to 35.0 in Santa Cruz County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 11 counties (9 with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 44.9 age-adjusted deaths due to lung cancer per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 8
DEATHS DUE TO LUNG CANCER
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	10,730	3.0	28.0 *	31.8 *	0.0	68.8
2	SAN BENITO	50,087	15.0	29.9 *	34.3 *	16.9	51.6
3	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	80.5	31.5	35.0	27.3	42.7
4	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	488.5	28.2	36.0	32.8	39.2
5	KINGS	123,683	31.0	25.1	38.4	24.8	52.0
6	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	362.5	45.9	39.8	35.7	43.9
7	MARIN	247,073	104.5	42.3	40.8	32.9	48.6
8	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	3,196.5	32.9	41.9	40.4	43.3
9	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	164.5	40.3	41.9	35.5	48.3
10	IMPERIAL	150,381	49.5	32.9	42.7	30.8	54.6
11	SAN MATEO	735,381	323.0	43.9	43.3	38.6	48.1
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:						44.9	
12	MODOC	10,384	6.0	57.8 *	45.2 *	8.7	81.7
13	AMADOR	34,410	23.5	68.3	45.3	26.7	63.9
14	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	409.0	44.4	45.5	41.1	49.9
15	TULARE	371,640	139.5	37.5	46.0	38.4	53.6
16	ORANGE	2,787,593	1,000.5	35.9	46.1	43.3	49.0
17	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	128.0	51.6	46.4	38.2	54.5
18	FRESNO	800,121	301.0	37.6	46.8	41.5	52.1
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	13,707.5	40.2	46.8	46.0	47.6
19	MADERA	121,779	53.5	43.9	47.5	34.8	60.3
20	VENTURA	744,825	299.0	40.1	47.8	42.4	53.3
21	MERCED	210,707	76.0	36.1	47.9	37.1	58.7
22	MONTEREY	395,133	150.5	38.1	47.9	40.3	55.6
23	EL DORADO	156,996	79.5	50.6	48.3	37.6	58.9
24	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	741.0	48.8	48.5	45.0	52.0
25	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	1,215.0	42.1	49.5	46.7	52.2
26	SONOMA	450,187	231.0	51.3	49.6	43.2	56.0
27	YOLO	160,805	63.5	39.5	49.9	37.6	62.1
28	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	623.5	43.0	50.1	46.2	54.1
29	HUMBOLDT	127,658	64.5	50.5	51.1	38.6	63.5
30	KERN	662,472	278.5	42.0	51.3	45.2	57.3
31	NEVADA	94,014	70.5	75.0	51.5	39.4	63.7
32	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	268.0	47.3	53.3	46.9	59.7
33	SUTTER	79,992	43.5	54.4	53.3	37.5	69.2
34	LASSEN	35,208	16.5	46.9 *	54.1 *	28.0	80.3
35	NAPA	125,123	82.5	65.9	54.2	42.4	66.0
36	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	649.5	38.5	54.3	50.1	58.5
37	TUOLUMNE	54,631	40.0	73.2	54.5	37.3	71.6
38	SISKIYOU	44,847	32.5	72.5	55.1	36.0	74.2
39	DEL NORTE	30,358	18.5	60.9 *	55.2 *	30.0	80.5
40	MENDOCINO	88,978	53.0	59.6	55.3	40.4	70.2
41	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	598.5	50.3	57.0	52.4	61.5
42	INYO	18,348	15.5	84.5 *	58.6 *	29.1	88.0
43	BUTTE	204,216	151.5	74.2	58.7	49.2	68.3
44	SOLANO	392,201	174.5	44.5	58.8	50.0	67.6
45	SIERRA	3,427	3.0	87.5 *	58.9 *	0.0	126.4
46	STANISLAUS	446,056	226.5	50.8	59.8	52.0	67.6
47	PLUMAS	20,714	19.0	91.7	60.4 *	32.8	88.1
48	MARIPOSA	16,339	14.5	88.7 *	61.0 *	29.1	92.8
49	SHASTA	171,211	124.0	72.4	63.6	52.4	74.8
50	COLUSA	20,091	12.5	62.2 *	64.0 *	28.5	99.6
51	LAKE	58,335	58.5	100.3	65.3	48.0	82.6
52	PLACER	233,836	159.0	68.0	68.8	58.1	79.5
53	CALAVERAS	40,597	40.0	98.5	68.8	47.1	90.5
54	GLENN	28,438	20.0	70.3	69.3	38.8	99.8
55	TEHAMA	55,806	52.0	93.2	72.4	52.5	92.3
56	TRINITY	13,353	14.5	108.6 *	85.3 *	41.0	129.5
57	YUBA	63,062	47.0	74.5	91.5	65.3	117.7
58	ALPINE	1,226	1.0	81.6 *	95.7 *	0.0	283.6

TABLE 9: DEATHS DUE TO FEMALE BREAST CANCER, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked By Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from female breast cancer for California was 24.5 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 4,076 females. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths of 4,164.0 and a female population of 16,972,666 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 44.3 in Humboldt County to 20.3 in Santa Barbara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.2 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from female breast cancer for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 25.2 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 39.3 in Humboldt County to 18.3 in San Francisco County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 13 counties (3 with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 22.3 age-adjusted deaths due to female breast cancer per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 female population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 9
DEATHS DUE TO FEMALE BREAST CANCER
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 FEMALE POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	587	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	DEL NORTE	13,952	2.5	17.9 *	15.5 *	0.0	35.2
3	LASSEN	13,706	2.5	18.2 *	15.9 *	0.0	35.7
4	SAN FRANCISCO	397,637	92.0	23.1	18.3	14.5	22.1
5	MODOC	5,085	1.5	29.5 *	18.3 *	0.0	47.6
6	MADERA	62,883	11.5	18.3 *	18.8 *	7.9	29.7
7	MONO	4,962	1.0	20.2 *	19.0 *	0.0	56.8
8	SANTA BARBARA	201,483	41.0	20.3	19.4	13.4	25.4
9	NEVADA	47,707	15.0	31.4 *	19.9 *	9.7	30.1
10	COLUSA	9,761	2.0	20.5 *	20.8 *	0.0	49.8
11	KINGS	56,363	9.5	16.9 *	21.6 *	7.9	35.4
12	SANTA CLARA	851,134	176.5	20.7	22.3	19.0	25.6
13	NAPA	63,003	17.5	27.8 *	22.3 *	11.6	33.0
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					22.3		
14	CALAVERAS	20,559	7.0	34.0 *	22.4 *	5.6	39.2
15	SANTA CRUZ	128,048	30.5	23.8	22.5	14.4	30.6
16	FRESNO	402,902	82.0	20.4	22.6	17.7	27.5
17	MONTEREY	187,719	41.5	22.1	23.4	16.3	30.6
18	AMADOR	15,908	5.5	34.6 *	23.6 *	3.3	43.9
19	ORANGE	1,378,230	303.0	22.0	23.9	21.2	26.6
20	SAN MATEO	371,265	101.0	27.2	24.0	19.3	28.7
21	KERN	324,854	69.5	21.4	24.0	18.3	29.6
22	SUTTER	40,320	10.5	26.0 *	24.1 *	9.4	38.8
23	LOS ANGELES	4,859,767	1,079.5	22.2	24.2	22.7	25.6
24	LAKE	29,812	10.0	33.5 *	24.5 *	8.6	40.4
25	TULARE	186,146	41.0	22.0	24.6	17.0	32.2
26	SISKIYOU	22,859	7.5	32.8 *	24.6 *	6.6	42.6
27	BUTTE	104,517	34.0	32.5	24.6	16.0	33.2
28	SAN LUIS OBISPO	120,632	36.5	30.3	25.1	16.6	33.5
29	EL DORADO	78,573	21.5	27.4	25.2	14.5	35.8
CALIFORNIA		16,972,666	4,164.0	24.5	25.2	24.5	26.0
30	INYO	9,362	3.5	37.4 *	25.4 *	0.0	52.7
31	SAN JOAQUIN	279,628	68.0	24.3	25.6	19.5	31.7
32	STANISLAUS	226,081	54.5	24.1	25.9	19.0	32.7
33	RIVERSIDE	760,600	206.0	27.1	25.9	22.3	29.5
34	CONTRA COSTA	466,755	131.0	28.1	25.9	21.5	30.4
35	TUOLUMNE	25,980	9.5	36.6 *	26.3 *	9.1	43.4
36	ALAMEDA	730,696	195.0	26.7	26.5	22.8	30.2
37	MENDOCINO	44,521	14.0	31.4 *	26.9 *	12.7	41.0
38	SONOMA	228,547	72.5	31.7	27.0	20.7	33.2
39	SAN BERNARDINO	841,879	188.5	22.4	27.4	23.5	31.3
40	IMPERIAL	73,015	17.0	23.3 *	27.8 *	14.5	41.0
41	TEHAMA	28,447	10.0	35.2 *	28.3 *	10.4	46.2
42	SAN DIEGO	1,415,670	381.0	26.9	28.4	25.5	31.3
43	SHASTA	87,195	30.0	34.4	28.5	18.2	38.8
44	VENTURA	368,257	105.0	28.5	29.3	23.7	35.0
45	SACRAMENTO	604,885	175.5	29.0	29.6	25.2	33.9
46	SOLANO	191,963	50.5	26.3	29.7	21.4	37.9
47	PLACER	117,759	38.5	32.7	30.3	20.7	39.9
48	YUBA	31,571	8.5	26.9 *	30.8 *	10.0	51.5
49	PLUMAS	10,402	4.5	43.3 *	31.2 *	1.5	60.9
50	SAN BENITO	24,778	7.5	30.3 *	32.0 *	9.1	55.0
51	GLENN	14,135	4.5	31.8 *	32.6 *	2.1	63.2
52	MARIN	123,951	46.0	37.1	32.7	23.2	42.1
53	SIERRA	1,722	1.0	58.1 *	32.9 *	0.0	100.1
54	MERCED	104,372	29.0	27.8	33.0	21.0	45.0
55	YOLO	80,961	23.0	28.4	33.3	19.6	46.9
56	HUMBOLDT	64,396	28.5	44.3	39.3	24.8	53.9
57	TRINITY	6,615	3.5	52.9 *	39.6 *	0.0	81.6
58	MARIPOSA	8,149	5.0	61.4 *	48.8 *	4.8	92.8

TABLE 10: DEATHS DUE TO CORONARY HEART DISEASE, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked By Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from coronary heart disease for California was 169.5 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 590 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths of 57,753.5 from 1999 to 2000 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 312.0 in Lake County to 93.8 in San Benito County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.3 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from coronary heart disease for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 201.5 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 259.8 in San Bernardino County to 110.8 in San Benito County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 30 counties (26 with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 166.0 age-adjusted deaths due to coronary heart disease per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 10
DEATHS DUE TO CORONARY HEART DISEASE
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	10,730	6.0	55.9 *	79.1 *	14.2	144.0
2	SIERRA	3,427	5.0	145.9 *	82.6 *	9.0	156.2
3	ALPINE	1,226	1.0	81.6 *	95.7 *	0.0	283.6
4	MODOC	10,384	14.5	139.6 *	100.6 *	48.4	152.8
5	SAN BENITO	50,087	47.0	93.8	110.8	79.1	142.6
6	DEL NORTE	30,358	40.0	131.8	119.8	82.5	157.2
7	PLUMAS	20,714	38.5	185.9	128.9	87.7	170.1
8	NEVADA	94,014	178.5	189.9	130.2	110.9	149.4
9	SISKIYOU	44,847	80.5	179.5	138.0	107.6	168.4
10	SAN MATEO	735,381	1,023.0	139.1	139.8	131.2	148.4
11	MARIPOSA	16,339	35.5	217.3	143.3	95.6	191.0
12	LASSEN	35,208	44.0	125.0	143.9	101.3	186.4
13	BUTTE	204,216	415.0	203.2	144.1	130.0	158.3
14	YOLO	160,805	188.5	117.2	148.1	127.0	169.3
15	MARIN	247,073	371.0	150.2	149.7	134.4	164.9
16	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	371.5	145.2	155.2	139.3	171.1
17	HUMBOLDT	127,658	198.0	155.1	155.5	133.9	177.2
18	CALAVERAS	40,597	89.0	219.2	156.1	123.1	189.0
19	MENDOCINO	88,978	151.0	169.7	157.2	132.1	182.3
20	GLENN	28,438	48.0	168.8	158.4	113.3	203.4
21	MONTEREY	395,133	488.0	123.5	159.0	144.9	173.1
22	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	1,544.0	195.7	159.2	151.2	167.2
23	EL DORADO	156,996	241.0	153.5	159.7	139.3	180.1
24	AMADOR	34,410	83.0	241.2	160.6	125.7	195.4
25	NAPA	125,123	269.0	215.0	160.8	141.4	180.2
26	COLUSA	20,091	33.0	164.3	161.4	106.2	216.6
27	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	665.0	162.9	163.0	150.6	175.4
28	TRINITY	13,353	26.0	194.7	164.2	99.9	228.5
29	TUOLUMNE	54,631	121.5	222.4	165.1	135.4	194.8
30	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	478.0	192.8	165.7	150.7	180.7
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					166.0		
31	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	1,403.5	152.3	166.1	157.4	174.8
32	SONOMA	450,187	848.5	188.5	172.5	160.8	184.1
33	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	2,096.5	121.0	173.8	166.2	181.3
34	VENTURA	744,825	1,032.0	138.6	173.8	163.2	184.5
35	TEHAMA	55,806	126.5	226.7	174.6	143.8	205.4
36	IMPERIAL	150,381	199.5	132.7	175.0	150.6	199.3
37	SHASTA	171,211	336.5	196.5	176.7	157.8	195.6
38	INYO	18,348	51.5	280.7	180.7	130.9	230.4
39	TULARE	371,640	564.5	151.9	182.4	167.3	197.4
40	SOLANO	392,201	492.0	125.4	185.5	168.8	202.2
41	PLACER	233,836	413.0	176.6	186.8	168.7	204.8
42	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	4,614.0	160.0	187.3	181.9	192.7
43	MERCED	210,707	284.5	135.0	187.6	165.7	209.5
44	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	2,299.0	158.7	188.0	180.3	195.7
45	MADERA	121,779	214.5	176.1	191.6	165.9	217.3
46	LAKE	58,335	182.0	312.0	192.4	163.7	221.2
47	FRESNO	800,121	1,301.0	162.6	200.0	189.1	210.8
48	KINGS	123,683	156.5	126.5	201.2	169.5	232.8
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	57,753.5	169.5	201.5	199.8	203.1
49	SUTTER	79,992	170.0	212.5	205.9	174.9	236.9
50	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	1,065.0	187.9	206.1	193.7	218.5
51	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	2,171.0	182.6	217.6	208.4	226.8
52	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	3,509.0	230.9	226.0	218.5	233.5
53	ORANGE	2,787,593	4,526.5	162.4	228.1	221.4	234.8
54	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	17,148.5	176.3	231.8	228.3	235.3
55	KERN	662,472	1,290.5	194.8	239.1	226.0	252.1
56	STANISLAUS	446,056	906.0	203.1	240.7	225.0	256.4
57	YUBA	63,062	124.0	196.6	243.3	200.4	286.1
58	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	2,933.5	173.7	259.8	250.3	269.2

TABLE 11: DEATHS DUE TO CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE (STROKE), 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from cerebrovascular disease for California was 53.1 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 1,884 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths of 18,084.5 from 1999 to 2000 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 116.6 in Lake County to 36.6 in Imperial County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.2 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from cerebrovascular disease for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 63.3 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 98.1 in Yuba County to 45.9 in Madera County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 11 counties (3 with a reliable age-adjusted death rate), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 48.0 age-adjusted deaths due to cerebrovascular disease per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 11
DEATHS DUE TO CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	PLUMAS	20,714	9.0	43.4 *	30.9 *	10.6	51.3
2	MONO	10,730	2.5	23.3 *	34.8 *	0.0	78.8
3	LASSEN	35,208	11.0	31.2 *	36.2 *	14.8	57.6
4	COLUSA	20,091	8.0	39.8 *	39.4 *	12.0	66.8
5	SIERRA	3,427	2.5	73.0 *	40.0 *	0.0	89.9
6	INYO	18,348	13.0	70.9 *	43.3 *	19.7	66.9
7	DEL NORTE	30,358	15.5	51.1 *	44.3 *	22.2	66.4
8	MARIPOSA	16,339	11.5	70.4 *	44.9 *	18.8	71.0
9	MADERA	121,779	51.5	42.3	45.9	33.4	58.5
10	CALAVERAS	40,597	26.5	65.3	47.3	29.0	65.6
11	TUOLUMNE	54,631	36.5	66.8	47.3	31.9	62.8
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:						48.0	
12	IMPERIAL	150,381	55.0	36.6	48.6	35.8	61.5
13	EL DORADO	156,996	72.5	46.2	49.5	38.0	61.0
14	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	119.0	46.5	49.7	40.7	58.7
15	ALPINE	1,226	0.5	40.8 *	49.8 *	0.0	187.9
16	TRINITY	13,353	8.0	59.9 *	51.2 *	15.2	87.2
17	SHASTA	171,211	99.5	58.1	52.2	41.9	62.5
18	SAN BENITO	50,087	22.5	44.9	53.5	31.4	75.6
19	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	854.0	56.2	54.6	50.9	58.3
20	AMADOR	34,410	29.0	84.3	56.2	35.5	76.8
21	TEHAMA	55,806	41.5	74.4	56.8	39.3	74.2
22	SISKIYOU	44,847	34.0	75.8	57.0	37.8	76.2
23	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	170.0	68.6	57.3	48.6	65.9
24	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	4,422.5	45.5	59.7	58.0	61.5
25	KERN	662,472	326.0	49.2	60.3	53.8	66.9
26	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	595.0	75.4	60.4	55.5	65.2
27	MONTEREY	395,133	187.0	47.3	61.3	52.5	70.1
28	TULARE	371,640	192.5	51.8	61.8	53.1	70.6
29	MENDOCINO	88,978	59.5	66.9	62.1	46.3	77.9
30	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	1,542.5	53.5	62.3	59.2	65.4
31	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	739.5	42.7	62.5	57.9	67.0
32	NEVADA	94,014	86.5	92.0	62.8	49.5	76.2
33	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	709.5	42.0	62.8	58.2	67.5
34	BUTTE	204,216	190.5	93.3	63.1	54.0	72.1
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	18,084.5	53.1	63.3	62.3	64.2
35	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	264.0	64.7	63.6	55.9	71.3
36	FRESNO	800,121	418.5	52.3	64.2	58.0	70.3
37	VENTURA	744,825	383.5	51.5	65.3	58.8	71.9
38	KINGS	123,683	50.5	40.8	65.6	47.5	83.8
39	MERCED	210,707	100.0	47.5	66.4	53.3	79.5
40	SAN MATEO	735,381	483.0	65.7	66.4	60.5	72.4
41	MODOC	10,384	10.0	96.3 *	66.5 *	25.2	107.7
42	STANISLAUS	446,056	252.0	56.5	66.6	58.4	74.8
43	LAKE	58,335	68.0	116.6	67.2	51.0	83.4
44	ORANGE	2,787,593	1,338.5	48.0	67.7	64.1	71.4
45	PLACER	233,836	151.0	64.6	68.6	57.6	79.6
46	SONOMA	450,187	348.0	77.3	70.4	63.0	77.8
47	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	859.0	59.3	70.7	65.9	75.4
48	HUMBOLDT	127,658	91.5	71.7	71.7	57.0	86.4
49	GLENN	28,438	22.5	79.1	72.3	42.4	102.3
50	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	731.5	61.5	73.7	68.3	79.0
51	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	384.0	67.7	73.7	66.3	81.1
52	MARIN	247,073	185.0	74.9	75.0	64.2	85.8
53	YOLO	160,805	96.0	59.7	75.1	60.0	90.1
54	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	634.0	68.8	76.4	70.4	82.3
55	NAPA	125,123	135.0	107.9	79.0	65.6	92.4
56	SUTTER	79,992	66.5	83.1	80.7	61.3	100.1
57	SOLANO	392,201	219.0	55.8	85.2	73.7	96.6
58	YUBA	63,062	49.5	78.5	98.1	70.7	125.5

TABLE 12: DRUG-RELATED DEATHS, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked By Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from drug-related deaths for California was 8.5 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 11,765 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths of 2,896.0 from 1999 to 2000 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 21.5 in Humboldt County to 4.3 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from drug-related deaths for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 8.7 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 21.0 in Humboldt County to 4.2 in Santa Clara County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

Altogether 5 counties (none with reliable age-adjusted death rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 1.0 age-adjusted drug-related death per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 12
DRUG-RELATED DEATHS
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	GLENN	28,438	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	TRINITY	13,353	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
3	MONO	10,730	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
4	SIERRA	3,427	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
5	ALPINE	1,226	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					1.0		
6	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	75.0	4.3	4.2	3.2	5.1
7	TUOLUMNE	54,631	2.5	4.6 *	4.5 *	0.0	10.1
8	LASSEN	35,208	1.5	4.3 *	4.8 *	0.0	12.5
9	INYO	18,348	1.0	5.5 *	4.9 *	0.0	14.6
10	NAPA	125,123	6.5	5.2 *	4.9 *	1.1	8.8
11	PLACER	233,836	12.0	5.1 *	5.2 *	2.2	8.1
12	AMADOR	34,410	2.0	5.8 *	5.3 *	0.0	12.8
13	SUTTER	79,992	4.5	5.6 *	5.9 *	0.4	11.4
14	NEVADA	94,014	6.0	6.4 *	6.3 *	1.1	11.5
15	MADERA	121,779	7.0	5.7 *	6.4 *	1.6	11.2
16	SAN BENITO	50,087	3.0	6.0 *	6.5 *	0.0	14.0
17	SAN MATEO	735,381	51.5	7.0	6.8	4.9	8.6
18	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	64.0	6.9	6.8	5.1	8.5
19	BUTTE	204,216	13.5	6.6 *	7.0 *	3.3	10.8
20	ORANGE	2,787,593	202.0	7.2	7.3	6.3	8.3
21	SOLANO	392,201	27.5	7.0	7.3	4.5	10.1
22	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	746.5	7.7	7.8	7.2	8.4
23	MONTEREY	395,133	28.5	7.2	7.8	4.9	10.7
24	EL DORADO	156,996	12.5	8.0 *	7.8 *	3.4	12.2
25	MERCED	210,707	14.5	6.9 *	8.1 *	3.9	12.3
26	FRESNO	800,121	58.0	7.2	8.1	6.0	10.2
27	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	97.0	8.2	8.2	6.5	9.8
28	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	123.0	8.5	8.2	6.8	9.7
29	YOLO	160,805	10.5	6.5 *	8.3 *	3.2	13.3
30	COLUSA	20,091	1.5	7.5 *	8.4 *	0.0	21.9
31	VENTURA	744,825	64.0	8.6	8.7	6.6	10.9
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	2,896.0	8.5	8.7	8.3	9.0
32	PLUMAS	20,714	2.0	9.7 *	9.1 *	0.0	21.9
33	SISKIYOU	44,847	4.0	8.9 *	9.3 *	0.0	18.7
34	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	133.0	8.8	9.3	7.7	10.9
35	MARIPOSA	16,339	1.5	9.2 *	9.4 *	0.0	25.2
36	SONOMA	450,187	46.0	10.2	9.7	6.9	12.5
37	KINGS	123,683	10.5	8.5 *	10.0 *	3.9	16.2
38	MODOC	10,384	1.0	9.6 *	10.1 *	0.0	30.1
39	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	160.0	9.5	10.1	8.5	11.6
40	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	265.0	9.2	10.1	8.9	11.4
41	CALAVERAS	40,597	3.5	8.6 *	10.5 *	0.0	21.7
42	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	42.5	10.4	10.6	7.4	13.8
43	MARIN	247,073	28.5	11.5	10.6	6.7	14.5
44	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	28.0	10.9	10.7	6.7	14.7
45	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	25.0	10.1	10.9	6.5	15.2
46	TULARE	371,640	37.5	10.1	11.5	7.8	15.2
47	IMPERIAL	150,381	14.5	9.6 *	11.6 *	5.5	17.7
48	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	63.0	11.1	11.8	8.9	14.7
49	STANISLAUS	446,056	56.0	12.6	13.5	10.0	17.1
50	TEHAMA	55,806	7.0	12.5 *	13.8 *	3.5	24.1
51	KERN	662,472	84.0	12.7	13.8	10.9	16.8
52	DEL NORTE	30,358	4.0	13.2 *	14.5 *	0.3	28.8
53	SHASTA	171,211	24.5	14.3	15.2	9.2	21.2
54	MENDOCINO	88,978	13.5	15.2 *	15.3 *	7.1	23.5
55	YUBA	63,062	9.0	14.3 *	16.4 *	5.6	27.2
56	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	158.5	20.1	18.2	15.4	21.1
57	LAKE	58,335	11.0	18.9 *	19.7 *	7.7	31.7
58	HUMBOLDT	127,658	27.5	21.5	21.0	13.1	28.8

TABLE 13: DEATHS DUE TO DIABETES, 1999-2000

California Counties Ranked by Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from diabetes for California was 17.9 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 5,582 persons. This rate was based on a two-year average number of deaths of 6,103.5 from 1999 to 2000 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 37.6 in Tehama County to 10.1 in Marin County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.7 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from diabetes for California for the two-year period from 1999 to 2000 was 20.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 48.1 in Kings County to 9.8 in Marin County. The difference between crude and age-adjusted rates shows how the county age composition differs from the 2000 United States population.

The Healthy People 2010 objective for diabetes mortality is based on both underlying and contributing causes of death. Multiple cause of death data for 1999 is not yet available for California. Therefore, California's progress in meeting this objective will not be addressed in this report.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 1999-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 13
DEATHS DUE TO DIABETES
RANKED BY TWO-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1999-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,226	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	MODOC	10,384	1.0	9.6 *	6.6 *	0.0	19.5
3	AMADOR	34,410	4.5	13.1 *	8.0 *	0.6	15.3
4	NEVADA	94,014	11.5	12.2 *	8.9 *	3.7	14.2
5	MARIN	247,073	25.0	10.1	9.8	5.9	13.6
6	SUTTER	79,992	8.0	10.0 *	9.8 *	3.0	16.6
7	CALAVERAS	40,597	6.0	14.8 *	10.8 *	1.9	19.7
8	SIERRA	3,427	0.5	14.6 *	11.2 *	0.0	42.2
9	MONO	10,730	1.0	9.3 *	11.4 *	0.0	35.1
10	TUOLUMNE	54,631	9.0	16.5 *	12.7 *	4.3	21.2
11	LASSEN	35,208	4.0	11.4 *	13.1 *	0.3	26.0
12	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	128.5	16.3	13.7	11.3	16.1
13	MARIPOSA	16,339	3.5	21.4 *	14.2 *	0.0	29.3
14	SAN MATEO	735,381	106.5	14.5	14.3	11.6	17.0
15	INYO	18,348	4.0	21.8 *	14.5 *	0.1	28.8
16	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	40.5	16.3	14.7	10.1	19.3
17	PLACER	233,836	34.0	14.5	15.0	10.0	20.1
18	BUTTE	204,216	42.5	20.8	15.0	10.4	19.7
19	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	62.0	15.2	15.7	11.8	19.7
20	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	238.5	15.7	15.7	13.7	17.7
21	COLUSA	20,091	3.0	14.9 *	16.0 *	0.0	34.1
22	SONOMA	450,187	78.0	17.3	16.6	12.9	20.3
23	GLENN	28,438	5.0	17.6 *	17.0 *	2.0	32.0
24	SISKIYOU	44,847	10.5	23.4 *	17.3 *	6.8	27.7
25	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	429.0	14.9	17.4	15.8	19.1
26	EL DORADO	156,996	28.0	17.8	17.7	11.1	24.3
27	PLUMAS	20,714	4.5	21.7 *	17.7 *	1.0	34.4
28	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	157.0	17.0	17.9	15.0	20.7
29	SAN BENITO	50,087	7.5	15.0 *	17.9 *	5.1	30.7
30	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	234.5	13.5	18.0	15.6	20.3
31	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	42.0	16.4	18.0	12.5	23.4
32	NAPA	125,123	29.5	23.6	18.7	11.9	25.5
33	ORANGE	2,787,593	401.0	14.4	18.8	17.0	20.7
34	LAKE	58,335	19.0	32.6	19.6 *	10.6	28.7
35	DEL NORTE	30,358	6.5	21.4 *	19.7 *	4.5	34.9
36	MONTEREY	395,133	63.0	15.9	20.0	15.1	25.0
37	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	212.0	17.8	20.3	17.6	23.1
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	6,103.5	17.9	20.8	20.3	21.4
38	IMPERIAL	150,381	25.0	16.6	21.5	13.0	29.9
39	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	281.5	19.4	22.6	19.9	25.2
40	VENTURA	744,825	139.5	18.7	22.7	18.9	26.5
41	YOLO	160,805	29.0	18.0	22.7	14.4	31.0
42	KERN	662,472	125.0	18.9	22.8	18.8	26.8
43	MENDOCINO	88,978	22.0	24.7	23.1	13.4	32.7
44	SOLANO	392,201	65.0	16.6	23.6	17.8	29.4
45	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	1,849.5	19.0	24.2	23.1	25.3
46	SHASTA	171,211	46.5	27.2	24.3	17.2	31.3
47	STANISLAUS	446,056	96.5	21.6	25.4	20.4	30.5
48	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	130.5	23.0	25.7	21.3	30.1
49	HUMBOLDT	127,658	33.0	25.9	26.2	17.3	35.2
50	TULARE	371,640	81.5	21.9	26.6	20.9	32.4
51	TRINITY	13,353	4.5	33.7 *	27.7 *	1.6	53.8
52	MADERA	121,779	31.5	25.9	27.8	18.1	37.6
53	TEHAMA	55,806	21.0	37.6	28.4	16.2	40.7
54	YUBA	63,062	15.0	23.8 *	28.8 *	14.2	43.4
55	FRESNO	800,121	191.0	23.9	29.4	25.3	33.6
56	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	367.0	21.7	30.5	27.3	33.6
57	MERCED	210,707	50.5	24.0	32.4	23.5	41.4
58	KINGS	123,683	38.0	30.7	48.1	32.7	63.5

TABLE 14: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF HEPATITIS C, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported Hepatitis C cases for California was 93.62 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported Hepatitis C case for every 1,068 persons. This rate was based on the 1998-2000 average reported number of cases of 31,900 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 710.41 in Del Norte County to 26.15 in San Mateo County, a difference in rates by a factor of 27.2 to 1.

Altogether 2 counties (none with reliable case rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 1.00 case per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

- * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, case rate based on no (zero) cases.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) cases.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level give an indication of the precision of the estimated case rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the rate. The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level define the range within which the case rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Disease Investigation & Surveillance Branch.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 14
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF HEPATITIS C
RANKED BY CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1998-2000 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,226	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	1.00	0.13 *	0.00	0.38
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE				1.00		
3	MODOC	10,384	0.33	3.21 *	0.00	14.11
4	MONO	10,730	2.33	21.75 *	0.00	49.65
5	SAN BENITO	50,087	12.67	25.29 *	11.36	39.22
6	SAN MATEO	735,381	192.33	26.15	22.46	29.85
7	NEVADA	94,014	25.33	26.95	16.45	37.44
8	GLENN	28,438	8.00	28.13 *	8.64	47.63
9	COLUSA	20,091	6.67	33.18 *	7.99	58.37
10	PLUMAS	20,714	7.67	37.01 *	10.81	63.21
11	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	673.67	46.50	42.99	50.01
12	PLACER	233,836	119.67	51.18	42.01	60.34
13	EL DORADO	156,996	87.00	55.42	43.77	67.06
14	AMADOR	34,410	20.67	60.06	34.17	85.95
15	MARIPOSA	16,339	10.33	63.24 *	24.68	101.80
16	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	170.67	66.71	56.70	76.72
17	INYO	18,348	12.33	67.22 *	29.70	104.73
18	SIERRA	3,427	2.33	68.09 *	0.00	155.45
19	VENTURA	744,825	518.00	69.55	63.56	75.54
20	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	854.33	71.85	67.03	76.67
21	FRESNO	800,121	594.67	74.32	68.35	80.30
22	MARIN	247,073	185.33	75.01	64.21	85.81
23	MERCED	210,707	158.33	75.14	63.44	86.85
24	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	1,310.33	75.65	71.56	79.75
25	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	2,202.00	76.34	73.15	79.53
26	ORANGE	2,787,593	2,326.33	83.45	80.06	86.84
27	TUOLUMNE	54,631	46.00	84.20	59.87	108.53
28	MONTEREY	395,133	334.00	84.53	75.46	93.59
29	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	210.00	84.72	73.26	96.18
30	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	8,476.33	87.13	85.28	88.99
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	31,900.33	93.62	92.60	94.65
31	TULARE	371,640	348.00	93.64	83.80	103.48
32	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	387.00	94.79	85.34	104.23
33	SUTTER	79,992	81.00	101.26	79.21	123.31
34	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	1,543.33	101.57	96.50	106.64
35	YOLO	160,805	164.00	101.99	86.38	117.60
36	TEHAMA	55,806	57.00	102.14	75.62	128.66
37	SISKIYOU	44,847	46.00	102.57	72.93	132.21
38	NAPA	125,123	142.33	113.75	95.07	132.44
39	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	1,942.67	115.02	109.91	120.13
40	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	1,128.33	122.42	115.28	129.57
41	YUBA	63,062	77.33	122.63	95.30	149.96
42	SONOMA	450,187	579.33	128.69	118.21	139.17
43	CALAVERAS	40,597	54.67	134.66	98.96	170.35
44	STANISLAUS	446,056	602.00	134.96	124.18	145.74
45	MENDOCINO	88,978	126.00	141.61	116.88	166.33
46	BUTTE	204,216	326.67	159.96	142.61	177.31
47	LAKE	58,335	103.00	176.57	142.47	210.67
48	SHASTA	171,211	344.33	201.12	179.87	222.36
49	SOLANO	392,201	790.00	201.43	187.38	215.47
50	TRINITY	13,353	27.33	204.70	127.96	281.44
51	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	1,190.33	210.01	198.08	221.94
52	KERN	662,472	1,400.00	211.33	200.26	222.40
53	HUMBOLDT	127,658	293.00	229.52	203.24	255.80
54	KINGS	123,683	331.67	268.16	239.30	297.02
55	IMPERIAL	150,381	406.33	270.20	243.93	296.48
56	MADERA	121,779	468.33	384.58	349.75	419.41
57	LASSEN	35,208	156.00	443.08	373.55	512.61
58	DEL NORTE	30,358	215.67	710.41	615.60	805.23

TABLE 15: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS AMONG POPULATION AGES 13 YEARS AND OVER, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported AIDS cases for Californians aged 13 years and older was 21.33 cases per 100,000 population ages 13 years and over or approximately one reported AIDS case for every 4,688 persons. This rate was based on a 1998 to 2000 three-year average reported number of cases of 5,260.00 and a population of 24,659,250 as of July 1, 1999. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 115.82 in San Francisco County to 7.99 in Santa Barbara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 14.5 to 1.

The Year 2010 National Objective for incidence of AIDS among population aged 13 years and older is 1.00 case per 100,000 population.

Altogether 4 counties (none with reliable case rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 1.00 case per 100,000 population aged 13 years and older.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population. The average number of cases excludes those with "unknown" county of residence.

- * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, case rate based on no (zero) cases.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) cases.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level give an indication of the precision of the estimated case rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the rate. The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level define the range within which the case rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Estimates with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 15
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS AMONG POPULATION AGES 13 YEARS AND OVER
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION AGED 13 AND OVER	1998-2000 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	COLUSA	14,258	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	MODOC	7,956	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	SIERRA	2,843	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	ALPINE	972	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				1.00		
5	GLENN	20,137	0.33	1.66 *	0.00	7.27
6	PLUMAS	16,421	0.33	2.03 *	0.00	8.92
7	INYO	14,129	0.33	2.36 *	0.00	10.37
8	PLACER	175,949	4.33	2.46 *	0.14	4.78
9	CALAVERAS	31,755	1.00	3.15 *	0.00	9.32
10	TRINITY	10,438	0.33	3.19 *	0.00	14.03
11	SHASTA	128,455	4.33	3.37 *	0.20	6.55
12	MONO	8,343	0.33	4.00 *	0.00	17.56
13	TEHAMA	41,687	1.67	4.00 *	0.00	10.07
14	DEL NORTE	22,849	1.00	4.38 *	0.00	12.95
15	IMPERIAL	100,385	4.67	4.65 *	0.43	8.87
16	EL DORADO	119,802	5.67	4.73 *	0.84	8.62
17	SISKIYOU	34,498	2.00	5.80 *	0.00	13.83
18	MERCED	142,540	9.00	6.31 *	2.19	10.44
19	SUTTER	57,995	3.67	6.32 *	0.00	12.79
20	TULARE	251,811	17.33	6.88 *	3.64	10.12
21	BUTTE	156,790	11.00	7.02 *	2.87	11.16
22	SAN BENITO	35,626	2.67	7.49 *	0.00	16.47
23	YUBA	43,433	3.33	7.67 *	0.00	15.91
24	MARIPOSA	12,971	1.00	7.71 *	0.00	22.82
25	YOLO	111,323	8.67	7.79 *	2.60	12.97
26	NAPA	96,321	7.67	7.96 *	2.33	13.59
27	SANTA BARBARA	300,357	24.00	7.99	4.79	11.19
28	VENTURA	542,243	44.33	8.18	5.77	10.58
29	HUMBOLDT	97,683	8.00	8.19 *	2.51	13.86
30	NEVADA	74,464	6.33	8.51 *	1.88	15.13
31	MENDOCINO	66,910	6.00	8.97 *	1.79	16.14
32	MADERA	85,215	7.67	9.00 *	2.63	15.37
33	TUOLUMNE	43,189	4.00	9.26 *	0.19	18.34
34	STANISLAUS	314,890	30.33	9.63	6.20	13.06
35	SANTA CLARA	1,291,399	140.33	10.87	9.07	12.66
36	CONTRA COSTA	693,935	77.00	11.10	8.62	13.57
37	FRESNO	551,126	64.00	11.61	8.77	14.46
38	SAN MATEO	559,684	65.00	11.61	8.79	14.44
39	SAN LUIS OBISPO	185,352	21.67	11.69	6.77	16.61
40	SAN JOAQUIN	404,005	48.00	11.88	8.52	15.24
41	SAN BERNARDINO	1,164,883	139.67	11.99	10.00	13.98
42	MONTEREY	277,808	33.33	12.00	7.93	16.07
43	SONOMA	344,640	44.67	12.96	9.16	16.76
44	AMADOR	28,185	3.67	13.01 *	0.00	26.33
45	SANTA CRUZ	192,139	26.33	13.71	8.47	18.94
46	LASSEN	26,456	4.00	15.12 *	0.30	29.94
47	ORANGE	2,016,201	312.33	15.49	13.77	17.21
48	LAKE	45,129	7.00	15.51 *	4.02	27.00
49	KERN	458,844	77.67	16.93	13.16	20.69
50	SACRAMENTO	869,811	158.67	18.24	15.40	21.08
	CALIFORNIA	24,659,250	5,260.00	21.33	20.75	21.91
51	ALAMEDA	1,077,962	272.00	25.23	22.23	28.23
52	SAN DIEGO	2,048,144	520.00	25.39	23.21	27.57
53	RIVERSIDE	1,088,164	277.00	25.46	22.46	28.45
54	KINGS	84,012	22.00	26.19	15.24	37.13
55	LOS ANGELES	6,949,122	1,849.33	26.61	25.40	27.83
56	SOLANO	284,983	81.33	28.54	22.34	34.74
57	MARIN	196,299	56.67	28.87	21.35	36.38
58	SAN FRANCISCO	636,329	737.00	115.82	107.46	124.18

TABLE 16: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported tuberculosis cases for California was 10.53 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported tuberculosis case for every 9,500 persons. This rate was based on a 1998 to 2000 three-year average reported number of cases of 3,586.67 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 25.86 in San Francisco County to 4.91 in Riverside County, a difference in rates by a factor of 5.3 to 1.

Altogether 5 counties, (none with reliable case rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 1.00 case per 100,000 population.

The Year 2010 National Objective of 1.00 case per 100,000 population reflects a decrease from the Year 2000 National Objective of 3.50 cases per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

- * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, case rate based on no (zero) cases.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) cases.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. Of two counties with the same case rate, the one with the larger population is ranked ahead of the smaller. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level give an indication of the precision of the estimated case rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the rate. The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level define the range within which the case rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Division of Communicable Disease Control.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Estimates with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 16
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1998-2000 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	TRINITY	13,353	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	MONO	10,730	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	SIERRA	3,427	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	ALPINE	1,226	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
5	CALAVERAS	40,597	0.33	0.82 *	0.00	3.61
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				1.00		
6	GLENN	28,438	0.33	1.17 *	0.00	5.15
7	PLACER	233,836	3.00	1.28 *	0.00	2.73
8	NEVADA	94,014	1.33	1.42 *	0.00	3.83
9	PLUMAS	20,714	0.33	1.61 *	0.00	7.07
10	COLUSA	20,091	0.33	1.66 *	0.00	7.29
11	EL DORADO	156,996	2.67	1.70 *	0.00	3.74
12	INYO	18,348	0.33	1.82 *	0.00	7.98
13	LASSEN	35,208	0.67	1.89 *	0.00	6.44
14	AMADOR	34,410	0.67	1.94 *	0.00	6.59
15	BUTTE	204,216	4.00	1.96 *	0.04	3.88
16	DEL NORTE	30,358	0.67	2.20 *	0.00	7.47
17	SHASTA	171,211	4.67	2.73 *	0.25	5.20
18	NAPA	125,123	3.67	2.93 *	0.00	5.93
19	SISKIYOU	44,847	1.33	2.97 *	0.00	8.02
20	TEHAMA	55,806	1.67	2.99 *	0.00	7.52
21	MENDOCINO	88,978	3.00	3.37 *	0.00	7.19
22	LAKE	58,335	2.00	3.43 *	0.00	8.18
23	SONOMA	450,187	16.67	3.70 *	1.92	5.48
24	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	10.00	3.91 *	1.49	6.33
25	MARIPOSA	16,339	0.67	4.08 *	0.00	13.87
26	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	10.33	4.17 *	1.63	6.71
27	MERCED	210,707	9.67	4.59 *	1.70	7.48
28	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	74.67	4.91	3.80	6.03
29	YOLO	160,805	8.67	5.39 *	1.80	8.98
30	MARIN	247,073	13.67	5.53 *	2.60	8.46
31	STANISLAUS	446,056	25.33	5.68	3.47	7.89
32	TULARE	371,640	22.00	5.92	3.45	8.39
33	TUOLUMNE	54,631	3.33	6.10 *	0.00	12.65
34	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	106.00	6.28	5.08	7.47
35	MODOC	10,384	0.67	6.42 *	0.00	21.83
36	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	26.67	6.53	4.05	9.01
37	SAN BENITO	50,087	3.33	6.66 *	0.00	13.80
38	VENTURA	744,825	54.33	7.29	5.36	9.23
39	HUMBOLDT	127,658	9.67	7.57 *	2.80	12.35
40	SUTTER	79,992	6.33	7.92 *	1.75	14.08
41	KERN	662,472	53.00	8.00	5.85	10.15
42	MADERA	121,779	10.00	8.21 *	3.12	13.30
43	SAN MATEO	735,381	62.67	8.52	6.41	10.63
44	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	109.67	9.22	7.50	10.95
45	SOLANO	392,201	36.33	9.26	6.25	12.28
46	ORANGE	2,787,593	263.33	9.45	8.31	10.59
47	KINGS	123,683	12.00	9.70 *	4.21	15.19
48	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	92.33	10.02	7.97	12.06
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	3,586.67	10.53	10.18	10.87
49	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	310.00	10.75	9.55	11.94
50	MONTEREY	395,133	43.33	10.97	7.70	14.23
51	YUBA	63,062	7.00	11.10 *	2.88	19.32
52	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	70.33	12.41	9.51	15.31
53	FRESNO	800,121	102.00	12.75	10.27	15.22
54	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	1,261.00	12.96	12.25	13.68
55	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	243.33	14.05	12.28	15.81
56	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	239.00	16.50	14.41	18.59
57	IMPERIAL	150,381	34.33	22.83	15.19	30.47
58	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	204.00	25.86	22.31	29.40

TABLE 17: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF CHLAMYDIA, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported chlamydia cases for California was 251.34 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported chlamydia case for every 398 persons. This rate was based on a 1998 to 2000 three-year average reported number of cases of 85,636.33 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 421.73 in Fresno County to 60.27 in Nevada County, a difference in rates by a factor of 7 to 1.

Prevalence data are not available in California to evaluate the Year 2010 National Objective of no more than 3 percent testing positive in the population aged 15 to 24 years.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

* Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. Of two counties with the same case rate, the one with the larger population is ranked ahead of the smaller. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level give an indication of the precision of the estimated case rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the rate. The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95% confidence level define the range within which the case rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Division of Communicable Disease Control.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Estimates with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 17
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF CHLAMYDIA
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1998-2000 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	CALAVERAS	40,597	14.00	34.49 *	16.42	52.55
2	AMADOR	34,410	13.00	37.78 *	17.24	58.32
3	SIERRA	3,427	1.33	38.91 *	0.00	104.95
4	TRINITY	13,353	6.67	49.93 *	12.03	87.83
5	PLUMAS	20,714	11.33	54.71 *	22.86	86.57
6	NEVADA	94,014	56.67	60.27	44.58	75.97
7	EL DORADO	156,996	95.00	60.51	48.34	72.68
8	LASSEN	35,208	22.00	62.49	36.37	88.60
9	MARIPOSA	16,339	10.33	63.24 *	24.68	101.80
10	MODOC	10,384	7.67	73.83 *	21.57	126.09
11	PLACER	233,836	188.67	80.68	69.17	92.20
12	LAKE	58,335	50.33	86.28	62.45	110.12
13	NAPA	125,123	113.33	90.58	73.90	107.25
14	TUOLUMNE	54,631	49.67	90.91	65.63	116.20
15	DEL NORTE	30,358	28.33	93.33	58.96	127.70
16	GLENN	28,438	29.33	103.15	65.82	140.48
17	MARIN	247,073	262.67	106.31	93.45	119.17
18	ALPINE	1,226	1.33	108.75 *	0.00	293.36
19	SONOMA	450,187	521.33	115.80	105.86	125.74
20	INYO	18,348	22.33	121.72	71.24	172.20
21	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	310.33	125.19	111.27	139.12
22	SISKIYOU	44,847	58.67	130.82	97.34	164.29
23	SAN BENITO	50,087	66.00	131.77	99.98	163.56
24	SAN MATEO	735,381	1,002.00	136.26	127.82	144.69
25	VENTURA	744,825	1,045.33	140.35	131.84	148.85
26	COLUSA	20,091	29.67	147.66	94.53	200.80
27	TEHAMA	55,806	85.67	153.51	121.00	186.02
28	ORANGE	2,787,593	4,323.33	155.09	150.47	159.72
29	MENDOCINO	88,978	138.33	155.47	129.56	181.38
30	SUTTER	79,992	125.67	157.10	129.63	184.57
31	YOLO	160,805	261.00	162.31	142.62	182.00
32	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	426.00	166.52	150.71	182.33
33	BUTTE	204,216	340.33	166.65	148.95	184.36
34	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	2,544.00	167.43	160.92	173.93
35	MONO	10,730	18.67	173.97 *	95.05	252.89
36	YUBA	63,062	115.00	182.36	149.03	215.69
37	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	788.33	193.08	179.60	206.56
38	SHASTA	171,211	333.67	194.89	173.97	215.80
39	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	1,800.00	195.30	186.28	204.32
40	IMPERIAL	150,381	306.33	203.70	180.89	226.52
41	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	3,561.00	205.60	198.84	212.35
42	MERCED	210,707	456.00	216.41	196.55	236.28
43	MONTEREY	395,133	892.00	225.75	210.93	240.56
44	STANISLAUS	446,056	1,015.00	227.55	213.55	241.55
45	MADERA	121,779	286.00	234.85	207.63	262.07
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	85,636.33	251.34	249.65	253.02
46	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	7,727.00	267.87	261.90	273.85
47	SOLANO	392,201	1,085.00	276.64	260.18	293.11
48	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	4,687.33	277.52	269.58	285.47
49	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	1,609.00	283.88	270.01	297.75
50	HUMBOLDT	127,658	372.67	291.93	262.29	321.57
51	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	29,714.00	305.45	301.98	308.93
52	TULARE	371,640	1,140.00	306.75	288.94	324.56
53	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	4,456.00	307.60	298.57	316.63
54	KINGS	123,683	390.00	315.32	284.03	346.62
55	KERN	662,472	2,095.00	316.24	302.70	329.78
56	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	2,807.67	355.86	342.70	369.03
57	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	4,344.67	365.39	354.52	376.25
58	FRESNO	800,121	3,374.33	421.73	407.50	435.96

TABLE 18: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SYPHILIS, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1998-2000 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
31	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	1.33	0.11 *	0.00	0.30
32	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	0.33	0.13 *	0.00	0.57
33	SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	0.33	0.13 *	0.00	0.59
34	SONOMA	450,187	0.67	0.15 *	0.00	0.50
35	SANTA BARBARA	408,292	0.67	0.16 *	0.00	0.56
36	SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	3.00	0.17 *	0.00	0.37
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				0.20		
37	RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	3.67	0.24 *	0.00	0.49
38	VENTURA	744,825	2.00	0.27 *	0.00	0.64
39	MARIN	247,073	0.67	0.27 *	0.00	0.92
40	SAN MATEO	735,381	2.33	0.32 *	0.00	0.72
41	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	3.00	0.33 *	0.00	0.69
42	MONTEREY	395,133	1.33	0.34 *	0.00	0.91
43	NEVADA	94,014	0.33	0.35 *	0.00	1.56
44	SOLANO	392,201	2.00	0.51 *	0.00	1.22
45	TULARE	371,640	2.00	0.54 *	0.00	1.28
46	SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	9.67	0.57 *	0.21	0.93
CALIFORNIA		34,072,478	203.00	0.60	0.51	0.68
47	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	10.33	0.71 *	0.28	1.15
48	MADERA	121,779	1.00	0.82 *	0.00	2.43
49	STANISLAUS	446,056	3.67	0.82 *	0.00	1.66
50	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	25.33	0.88	0.54	1.22
51	ORANGE	2,787,593	28.00	1.00	0.63	1.38
52	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	129.67	1.33	1.10	1.56
53	KERN	662,472	11.33	1.71 *	0.71	2.71
54	SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	11.00	1.94 *	0.79	3.09
55	MARIPOSA	16,339	0.33	2.04 *	0.00	8.97
56	FRESNO	800,121	17.00	2.12 *	1.11	3.13
57	MERCED	210,707	5.33	2.53 *	0.38	4.68
58	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	35.67	4.52	3.04	6.00

The crude case rate of reported primary and secondary syphilis cases for California was .60 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported syphilis case for every 167,845 persons. Table 18 shows only those counties where at least one case was reported. This rate was based on a 1998 to 2000 three-year average reported number of cases of 203.0, and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 4.52 in San Francisco County to .88 in San Diego County, a difference in rates by a factor of 5.1 to 1.

Altogether 36 counties (none with reliable case rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of .20 cases per 100,000 population.

(See Table 16 for Notes and Data Sources footnote.)

TABLE 19: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF MEASLES, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

TABLE 19
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF MEASLES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1998-2000 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				0.00		
48	SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	0.33	0.03 *	0.00	0.12
49	LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	3.33	0.03 *	0.00	0.07
50	SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	0.33	0.04 *	0.00	0.19
51	VENTURA	744,825	0.33	0.04 *	0.00	0.20
	CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	15.00	0.04 *	0.02	0.07
52	SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	1.67	0.06 *	0.00	0.15
53	CONTRA COSTA	921,662	0.67	0.07 *	0.00	0.25
54	ORANGE	2,787,593	2.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.19
55	MONTEREY	395,133	0.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.37
56	ALAMEDA	1,448,643	1.33	0.09 *	0.00	0.25
57	SAN MATEO	735,381	1.00	0.14 *	0.00	0.40
58	SANTA CRUZ	255,825	3.33	1.30 *	0.00	2.70

The crude case rate of reported measles cases for California was 0.04 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported measles case for every 2,271,499 persons. Table 19 shows only those counties where at least one case was reported. This rate was based on a 1998 to 2000 three-year average reported number of cases of 15.0 and a population of 34,072,478 as of July 1, 1999. Of the 58 counties, none had a "reliable" rate.

Altogether 47 counties met the Year 2010 National Objective of no reported cases of measles during the three-year period. Many of the remaining counties were so close to zero, that for all practical purposes, the Year 2010 National Objective has been met by these counties as well.

The Year 2010 National Objective for incidence of reported measles cases is zero cases, which is equivalent to a case rate of 0.00 per 100,000 population.

(See Table 16 for Notes and Data Sources footnote.)

TABLE 20A: INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS, 1996, 1997, 1999

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.8 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 172 births. This rate was based on the 3,072.7 infant deaths among 527,087.0 live births, the three-year average for the years 1996, 1997, and 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 7.6 in Fresno County to 4.2 in Santa Barbara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.8 to 1.

Altogether 16 counties (4 with reliable rates), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 4.5 infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using the data years 1996, 1997, and 1999. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and are grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 1996, 1997, 1999.

TABLE 20A
INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1996, 1997, 1999

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	119.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	13.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	ALPINE	9.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	TEHAMA	644.7	1.7	2.6 *	0.0	6.5
5	TRINITY	111.7	0.3	3.0 *	0.0	13.1
6	PLACER	2,774.0	9.0	3.2 *	1.1	5.4
7	LASSEN	303.3	1.0	3.3 *	0.0	9.8
8	SISKIYOU	473.0	1.7	3.5 *	0.0	8.9
9	EL DORADO	1,655.7	6.7	4.0 *	1.0	7.1
10	CALAVERAS	324.0	1.3	4.1 *	0.0	11.1
11	SANTA BARBARA	5,754.3	24.0	4.2	2.5	5.8
12	SAN FRANCISCO	8,228.0	36.3	4.4	3.0	5.9
13	SONOMA	5,444.0	24.3	4.5	2.7	6.2
14	SAN MATEO	10,067.7	45.0	4.5	3.2	5.8
15	MARIN	2,648.7	12.0	4.5 *	2.0	7.1
16	PLUMAS	147.0	0.7	4.5 *	0.0	15.4
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				4.5		
17	ORANGE	47,340.7	222.0	4.7	4.1	5.3
18	GLENN	418.0	2.0	4.8 *	0.0	11.4
19	MARIPOSA	138.3	0.7	4.8 *	0.0	16.4
20	SANTA CLARA	26,444.3	132.0	5.0	4.1	5.8
21	NAPA	1,500.7	7.7	5.1 *	1.5	8.7
22	COLUSA	314.7	1.7	5.3 *	0.0	13.3
23	IMPERIAL	2,447.3	13.0	5.3 *	2.4	8.2
24	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,445.3	13.0	5.3 *	2.4	8.2
25	HUMBOLDT	1,476.7	8.0	5.4 *	1.7	9.2
26	CONTRA COSTA	12,389.0	69.0	5.6	4.3	6.9
27	SAN DIEGO	43,807.7	244.0	5.6	4.9	6.3
28	SAN BENITO	887.0	5.0	5.6 *	0.7	10.6
29	SANTA CRUZ	3,475.7	19.7	5.7	3.2	8.2
30	MONTEREY	6,692.0	38.3	5.7	3.9	7.5
	CALIFORNIA	527,087.0	3,072.7	5.8	5.6	6.0
31	LOS ANGELES	162,460.3	955.3	5.9	5.5	6.3
32	RIVERSIDE	23,447.0	138.0	5.9	4.9	6.9
33	SOLANO	5,608.0	33.7	6.0	4.0	8.0
34	AMADOR	274.3	1.7	6.1 *	0.0	15.3
35	ALAMEDA	20,664.3	127.0	6.1	5.1	7.2
36	BUTTE	2,328.7	14.3	6.2 *	3.0	9.3
37	VENTURA	11,464.3	73.3	6.4	4.9	7.9
38	SHASTA	1,965.3	13.0	6.6 *	3.0	10.2
39	STANISLAUS	7,025.0	46.7	6.6	4.7	8.5
40	YUBA	1,048.3	7.0	6.7 *	1.7	11.6
41	MADERA	1,984.0	13.3	6.7 *	3.1	10.3
42	MERCED	3,667.3	24.7	6.7	4.1	9.4
43	SAN BERNARDINO	28,698.0	193.3	6.7	5.8	7.7
44	NEVADA	787.3	5.3	6.8 *	1.0	12.5
45	SACRAMENTO	17,636.3	119.7	6.8	5.6	8.0
46	TULARE	6,965.0	47.7	6.8	4.9	8.8
47	YOLO	2,134.3	14.7	6.9 *	3.4	10.4
48	SAN JOAQUIN	8,783.7	63.0	7.2	5.4	8.9
49	MENDOCINO	1,019.3	7.3	7.2 *	2.0	12.4
50	KERN	11,403.7	84.7	7.4	5.8	9.0
51	FRESNO	14,259.3	107.7	7.6	6.1	9.0
52	KINGS	2,163.3	17.0	7.9 *	4.1	11.6
53	SUTTER	1,160.3	9.3	8.0 *	2.9	13.2
54	LAKE	575.0	4.7	8.1 *	0.8	15.5
55	DEL NORTE	318.3	2.7	8.4 *	0.0	18.4
56	TUOLUMNE	457.0	4.3	9.5 *	0.6	18.4
57	INYO	200.3	2.0	10.0 *	0.0	23.8
58	MODOC	93.3	1.3	14.3 *	0.0	38.5

TABLE 20B: ASIAN/OTHER INFANT MORTALITY, 1996, 1997, 1999

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The Asian/Other birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.2 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 191 births. This rate was based on the 325.7 infant deaths among 62,120.3 live births, the three-year average for the years 1996, 1997, and 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 6.4 in San Diego County to 4.4 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.5 to 1.

A Year 2010 National Objective for an Asian/Other birth cohort infant death rate has not been established.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparison between counties.

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using the data years 1996, 1997, and 1999. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, case rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and are grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 1996, 1997, 1999.

TABLE 20B
ASIAN/OTHER INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1996, 1997, 1999

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS	INFANT DEATH RATE		
					LOWER	UPPER
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED						
1	KINGS	115.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	EL DORADO	76.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	NAPA	60.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	IMPERIAL	34.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	SAN BENITO	30.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	GLENN	29.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	SISKIYOU	29.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	TEHAMA	23.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	NEVADA	22.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
10	CALAVERAS	10.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
11	AMADOR	10.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
12	TRINITY	9.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
13	COLUSA	8.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
14	MODOC	8.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
15	PLUMAS	8.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
16	MONO	6.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
17	MARIPOSA	5.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
18	ALPINE	5.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
19	SIERRA	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
20	SANTA BARBARA	283.7	0.7	2.4 *	0.0	8.0
21	VENTURA	1,147.0	3.3	2.9 *	0.0	6.0
22	HUMBOLDT	195.7	0.7	3.4 *	0.0	11.6
23	MARIN	191.0	0.7	3.5 *	0.0	11.9
24	SAN FRANCISCO	2,896.3	10.7	3.7 *	1.5	5.9
25	SAN LUIS OBISPO	89.0	0.3	3.7 *	0.0	16.5
26	SAN MATEO	2,400.7	9.3	3.9 *	1.4	6.4
27	SANTA CLARA	7,610.0	33.3	4.4	2.9	5.9
28	MONTEREY	444.0	2.0	4.5 *	0.0	10.7
29	PLACER	143.0	0.7	4.7 *	0.0	15.9
30	KERN	483.7	2.3	4.8 *	0.0	11.0
31	STANISLAUS	473.3	2.3	4.9 *	0.0	11.3
32	LOS ANGELES	16,165.0	82.0	5.1	4.0	6.2
33	ORANGE	6,106.0	31.0	5.1	3.3	6.9
34	SOLANO	905.0	4.7	5.2 *	0.5	9.8
35	ALAMEDA	4,922.0	25.7	5.2	3.2	7.2
	CALIFORNIA	62,120.3	325.7	5.2	4.7	5.8
36	SANTA CRUZ	189.0	1.0	5.3 *	0.0	15.7
37	FRESNO	1,571.0	8.3	5.3 *	1.7	8.9
38	BUTTE	243.0	1.3	5.5 *	0.0	14.8
39	SACRAMENTO	2,708.7	15.3	5.7 *	2.8	8.5
40	CONTRA COSTA	1,724.0	10.0	5.8 *	2.2	9.4
41	SAN DIEGO	4,751.7	30.3	6.4	4.1	8.7
42	SAN JOAQUIN	1,302.7	8.7	6.7 *	2.2	11.1
43	MENDOCINO	99.3	0.7	6.7 *	0.0	22.8
44	DEL NORTE	47.3	0.3	7.0 *	0.0	30.9
45	SONOMA	322.7	2.3	7.2 *	0.0	16.5
46	SAN BERNARDINO	1,601.7	12.0	7.5 *	3.3	11.7
47	TULARE	285.0	2.3	8.2 *	0.0	18.7
48	RIVERSIDE	1,080.3	9.0	8.3 *	2.9	13.8
49	SHASTA	145.3	1.3	9.2 *	0.0	24.7
50	MERCED	394.3	3.7	9.3 *	0.0	18.8
51	YOLO	209.7	2.0	9.5 *	0.0	22.8
52	INYO	31.3	0.3	10.6 *	0.0	46.8
53	YUBA	154.7	1.7	10.8 *	0.0	27.1
54	SUTTER	184.0	2.7	14.5 *	0.0	31.9
55	TUOLUMNE	22.7	0.3	14.7 *	0.0	64.6
56	MADERA	43.0	0.7	15.5 *	0.0	52.7
57	LASSEN	21.3	0.3	15.6 *	0.0	68.7
58	LAKE	38.7	1.3	34.5 *	0.0	93.0

TABLE 20C: BLACK INFANT MORTALITY, 1996, 1997, 1999

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The Black birth cohort infant death rate for California was 12.2 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 82 births. This rate was based on the 437.7 deaths among the 35,730.7 live births, the three-year average for the years 1996, 1997, and 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate for Blacks ranged from 12.6 in Alameda County to 10.7 in Sacramento County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.2 to 1.

A Year 2010 National Objective for a Black birth cohort infant death rate has not been established.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using the data years 1996, 1997, and 1999. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and are grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 1996, 1997, 1999.

TABLE 20C
BLACK INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1996, 1997, 1999

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS	INFANT DEATH RATE	LOWER	UPPER
	YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED					
1	IMPERIAL	30.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SAN LUIS OBISPO	23.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	PLACER	22.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	YUBA	19.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	NAPA	13.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	EL DORADO	9.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	TEHAMA	6.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	SISKIYOU	5.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	MENDOCINO	4.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
10	SAN BENITO	4.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
11	LASSEN	2.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
12	AMADOR	2.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
13	GLENN	2.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
14	PLUMAS	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
15	CALAVERAS	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
16	DEL NORTE	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
17	INYO	0.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
18	NEVADA	0.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
19	TRINITY	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
20	MARIPOSA	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
21	MONO	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
22	COLUSA	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
23	TUOLUMNE	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
24	MODOC	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
25	SIERRA	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
26	ALPINE	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
27	MARIN	56.7	0.3	5.9 *	0.0	25.9
28	BUTTE	43.7	0.3	7.6 *	0.0	33.5
29	SONOMA	84.3	0.7	7.9 *	0.0	26.9
30	SACRAMENTO	2,124.3	22.7	10.7	6.3	15.1
31	SOLANO	867.7	9.3	10.8 *	3.9	17.7
32	RIVERSIDE	1,469.0	16.3	11.1 *	5.7	16.5
33	ORANGE	711.7	8.0	11.2 *	3.5	19.0
34	SAN DIEGO	2,935.7	34.0	11.6	7.7	15.5
35	CONTRA COSTA	1,381.0	16.0	11.6 *	5.9	17.3
36	LOS ANGELES	14,496.7	170.7	11.8	10.0	13.5
37	SAN BERNARDINO	2,673.3	31.7	11.8	7.7	16.0
38	MONTEREY	138.7	1.7	12.0 *	0.0	30.3
	CALIFORNIA	35,730.7	437.7	12.2	11.1	13.4
39	SANTA BARBARA	106.3	1.3	12.5 *	0.0	33.8
40	MERCED	132.0	1.7	12.6 *	0.0	31.8
41	ALAMEDA	3,585.7	45.3	12.6	9.0	16.3
42	SAN FRANCISCO	815.0	10.3	12.7 *	4.9	20.4
43	SAN MATEO	325.3	4.3	13.3 *	0.8	25.9
44	KERN	673.7	9.7	14.3 *	5.3	23.4
45	SANTA CLARA	743.0	11.3	15.3 *	6.4	24.1
46	VENTURA	187.7	3.0	16.0 *	0.0	34.1
47	KINGS	121.3	2.0	16.5 *	0.0	39.3
48	SANTA CRUZ	19.3	0.3	17.2 *	0.0	75.8
49	FRESNO	798.7	14.3	17.9 *	8.7	27.2
50	SAN JOAQUIN	658.0	12.0	18.2 *	7.9	28.6
51	STANISLAUS	172.7	3.3	19.3 *	0.0	40.0
52	MADERA	46.7	1.0	21.4 *	0.0	63.4
53	TULARE	89.3	2.0	22.4 *	0.0	53.4
54	YOLO	44.3	1.0	22.6 *	0.0	66.8
55	HUMBOLDT	13.0	0.3	25.6 *	0.0	112.7
56	SHASTA	22.7	1.0	44.1 *	0.0	130.6
57	SUTTER	22.0	1.0	45.5 *	0.0	134.5
58	LAKE	10.7	0.7	62.5 *	0.0	212.5

TABLE 20D: HISPANIC INFANT MORTALITY, 1996, 1997, 1999

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The Hispanic birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.5 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 182 births. This rate was based on the 1,382.7 deaths among 250,960.3 live births, the three-year average for the years 1996, 1997, and 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 7.7 in Ventura County to 4.1 in Alameda County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.9 to 1.

A Year 2010 National Objective for a Hispanic birth cohort infant death rate has not been established.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using the data years 1996, 1997, and 1999. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and are grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 1996, 1997, 1999.

TABLE 20D
HISPANIC INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1996, 1997, 1999

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
	YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			NONE ESTABLISHED		
1	TEHAMA	186.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SISKIYOU	74.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	DEL NORTE	48.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	MONO	43.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	CALAVERAS	35.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	MODOC	19.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	MARIPOSA	14.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	PLUMAS	12.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	TRINITY	5.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
10	SIERRA	1.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
11	ALPINE	0.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
12	PLACER	417.7	0.7	1.6 *	0.0	5.4
13	GLENN	178.3	0.3	1.9 *	0.0	8.2
14	SHASTA	158.0	0.3	2.1 *	0.0	9.3
15	LAKE	104.3	0.3	3.2 *	0.0	14.0
16	SUTTER	349.7	1.3	3.8 *	0.0	10.3
17	SAN LUIS OBISPO	684.7	2.7	3.9 *	0.0	8.6
18	ALAMEDA	5,464.3	22.3	4.1	2.4	5.8
19	SOLANO	1,302.0	5.3	4.1 *	0.6	7.6
20	BUTTE	396.3	1.7	4.2 *	0.0	10.6
21	SAN MATEO	3,268.3	14.3	4.4 *	2.1	6.7
22	SONOMA	1,618.7	7.3	4.5 *	1.3	7.8
23	SANTA BARBARA	3,263.7	15.0	4.6 *	2.3	6.9
24	ORANGE	22,898.7	106.7	4.7	3.8	5.5
25	SAN FRANCISCO	1,881.0	9.0	4.8 *	1.7	7.9
26	YUBA	207.3	1.0	4.8 *	0.0	14.3
27	MERCED	2,031.7	10.3	5.1 *	2.0	8.2
28	SACRAMENTO	3,699.7	19.0	5.1	2.8	7.4
29	RIVERSIDE	12,117.0	63.3	5.2	3.9	6.5
30	SANTA CRUZ	1,702.3	9.0	5.3 *	1.8	8.7
31	SAN DIEGO	18,143.7	97.3	5.4	4.3	6.4
32	EL DORADO	307.0	1.7	5.4 *	0.0	13.7
33	LOS ANGELES	100,868.7	550.3	5.5	5.0	5.9
34	CONTRA COSTA	3,035.3	16.7	5.5 *	2.9	8.1
	CALIFORNIA	250,960.3	1,382.7	5.5	5.2	5.8
35	SANTA CLARA	9,294.0	51.7	5.6	4.0	7.1
36	IMPERIAL	2,007.7	11.3	5.6 *	2.4	8.9
37	SAN JOAQUIN	3,504.7	20.0	5.7	3.2	8.2
38	MONTEREY	4,374.7	25.7	5.9	3.6	8.1
39	SAN BERNARDINO	14,403.0	86.0	6.0	4.7	7.2
40	TULARE	4,569.7	27.7	6.1	3.8	8.3
41	MARIN	541.0	3.3	6.2 *	0.0	12.8
42	NAPA	635.7	4.0	6.3 *	0.1	12.5
43	COLUSA	207.0	1.3	6.4 *	0.0	17.4
44	MADERA	1,267.3	8.3	6.6 *	2.1	11.0
45	STANISLAUS	3,037.0	20.0	6.6	3.7	9.5
46	INYO	50.0	0.3	6.7 *	0.0	29.3
47	KINGS	1,138.0	7.7	6.7 *	2.0	11.5
48	YOLO	830.7	5.7	6.8 *	1.2	12.4
49	TUOLUMNE	48.7	0.3	6.8 *	0.0	30.1
50	HUMBOLDT	138.3	1.0	7.2 *	0.0	21.4
51	FRESNO	8,017.7	58.0	7.2	5.4	9.1
52	KERN	5,865.0	43.3	7.4	5.2	9.6
53	NEVADA	87.3	0.7	7.6 *	0.0	26.0
54	VENTURA	5,480.7	42.3	7.7	5.4	10.1
55	SAN BENITO	552.0	4.3	7.9 *	0.5	15.2
56	LASSEN	34.3	0.3	9.7 *	0.0	42.7
57	MENDOCINO	308.0	3.0	9.7 *	0.0	20.8
58	AMADOR	29.3	0.3	11.4 *	0.0	49.9

TABLE 20E: WHITE INFANT MORTALITY, 1996, 1997, 1999

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The White birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.2 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 192 births. This rate was based on the 926.7 deaths among 178,275.7 live births, the three-year average for the years 1996, 1997, and 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 7.0 in Fresno County to 4.1 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.7 to 1.

A Year 2010 National Objective for a White birth cohort infant death rate has not been established.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using the data years 1996, 1997, and 1999. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, death rate based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and are grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the death rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 1996, 1997, 1999.

TABLE 20E
WHITE INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1996, 1997, 1999

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
	YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED					
1	MONO	69.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	11.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	ALPINE	3.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	LASSEN	245.0	0.3	1.4 *	0.0	6.0
5	SAN BENITO	300.0	0.7	2.2 *	0.0	7.6
6	SAN FRANCISCO	2,635.7	6.3	2.4 *	0.5	4.3
7	SANTA BARBARA	2,100.7	7.0	3.3 *	0.9	5.8
8	COLUSA	99.0	0.3	3.4 *	0.0	14.8
9	TRINITY	96.3	0.3	3.5 *	0.0	15.2
10	PLACER	2,191.3	7.7	3.5 *	1.0	6.0
11	TEHAMA	429.3	1.7	3.9 *	0.0	9.8
12	EL DORADO	1,262.7	5.0	4.0 *	0.5	7.4
13	SANTA CLARA	8,797.3	35.7	4.1	2.7	5.4
14	SONOMA	3,418.3	14.0	4.1 *	2.0	6.2
15	MARIN	1,860.0	7.7	4.1 *	1.2	7.0
16	SAN MATEO	4,073.3	17.0	4.2 *	2.2	6.2
17	CONTRA COSTA	6,248.7	26.3	4.2	2.6	5.8
18	ORANGE	17,624.3	76.3	4.3	3.4	5.3
19	IMPERIAL	375.0	1.7	4.4 *	0.0	11.2
20	SAN DIEGO	17,976.7	82.3	4.6	3.6	5.6
21	SISKIYOU	363.7	1.7	4.6 *	0.0	11.5
22	NAPA	791.7	3.7	4.6 *	0.0	9.4
23	CALAVERAS	277.3	1.3	4.8 *	0.0	13.0
24	LOS ANGELES	30,930.0	152.3	4.9	4.1	5.7
25	ALAMEDA	6,692.3	33.7	5.0	3.3	6.7
26	MONTEREY	1,734.7	9.0	5.2 *	1.8	8.6
	CALIFORNIA	178,275.7	926.7	5.2	4.9	5.5
27	VENTURA	4,649.0	24.7	5.3	3.2	7.4
28	HUMBOLDT	1,129.7	6.0	5.3 *	1.1	9.6
29	MADERA	627.0	3.3	5.3 *	0.0	11.0
30	PLUMAS	125.0	0.7	5.3 *	0.0	18.1
31	LAKE	421.3	2.3	5.5 *	0.0	12.6
32	RIVERSIDE	8,780.7	49.3	5.6	4.1	7.2
33	MARIPOSA	118.3	0.7	5.6 *	0.0	19.2
34	SOLANO	2,533.3	14.3	5.7 *	2.7	8.6
35	YOLO	1,049.7	6.0	5.7 *	1.1	10.3
36	AMADOR	232.7	1.3	5.7 *	0.0	15.5
37	SANTA CRUZ	1,565.0	9.3	6.0 *	2.1	9.8
38	MENDOCINO	607.3	3.7	6.0 *	0.0	12.2
39	SAN LUIS OBISPO	1,648.3	10.0	6.1 *	2.3	9.8
40	STANISLAUS	3,342.0	21.0	6.3	3.6	9.0
41	SHASTA	1,639.3	10.3	6.3 *	2.5	10.1
42	SAN BERNARDINO	10,020.0	63.7	6.4	4.8	7.9
43	YUBA	657.3	4.3	6.6 *	0.4	12.8
44	BUTTE	1,645.7	11.0	6.7 *	2.7	10.6
45	KERN	4,381.3	29.3	6.7	4.3	9.1
46	SAN JOAQUIN	3,318.3	22.3	6.7	3.9	9.5
47	SACRAMENTO	9,103.7	62.7	6.9	5.2	8.6
48	NEVADA	677.3	4.7	6.9 *	0.6	13.1
49	FRESNO	3,872.0	27.0	7.0	4.3	9.6
50	SUTTER	604.7	4.3	7.2 *	0.4	13.9
51	TULARE	2,021.0	15.7	7.8 *	3.9	11.6
52	GLENN	208.0	1.7	8.0 *	0.0	20.2
53	MERCED	1,109.3	9.0	8.1 *	2.8	13.4
54	KINGS	789.0	7.3	9.3 *	2.6	16.0
55	TUOLUMNE	385.7	3.7	9.5 *	0.0	19.2
56	DEL NORTE	222.0	2.3	10.5 *	0.0	24.0
57	INYO	118.3	1.3	11.3 *	0.0	30.4
58	MODOC	65.7	1.3	20.3 *	0.0	54.8

TABLE 21: LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Percentage of Three-Year Average Low Birthweight Infants

The relative number of low birthweight infants for California was 6.2 per 100 live births, a percent equivalent to one in 16 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of low birthweight infants of 32,325.7 and a three-year average total number of live births of 523,530.7 from 1998 to 2000.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of low birthweight infants ranged from 7.2 in Yuba County to 4.0 in Mendocino County, a difference in percentage by a factor of 1.8 to 1.

Altogether 11 counties (5 with reliable percentages), but not California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of 5.0 percent low birthweight infants.

Notes:

Low birthweight includes infants less than 2500 grams at birth. The average number of live births excludes those births of unknown birthweight.

- * Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.
- + Standard error indeterminate, percent based on no (zero) low birthweight infants.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level are not calculated for no (zero) low birthweight infants.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of low birthweight infants (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. The wider the interval, the less precise the percent. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 1998-2000.

TABLE 21
LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LOW BIRTHWEIGHT PERCENTAGE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1998-2000 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		TOTAL NUMBER	LOW BIRTHWEIGHT		LOWER	UPPER
			NUMBER	PERCENT		
1	ALPINE	12.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	17.3	0.3	1.7 *	0.0	7.9
3	PLUMAS	137.7	4.0	2.9 *	0.1	5.8
4	MENDOCINO	1,059.0	42.3	4.0	2.8	5.2
5	MONO	127.3	5.3	4.2 *	0.6	7.7
6	DEL NORTE	310.0	14.3	4.6 *	2.2	7.0
7	LASSEN	280.3	13.0	4.6 *	2.1	7.2
8	HUMBOLDT	1,426.7	68.7	4.8	3.7	6.0
9	GLENN	383.7	19.0	5.0	2.7	7.2
10	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,388.3	118.3	5.0	4.1	5.8
11	BUTTE	2,239.7	113.0	5.0	4.1	6.0
YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				5.0		
12	TEHAMA	657.0	33.3	5.1	3.3	6.8
13	AMADOR	254.0	13.0	5.1 *	2.3	7.9
14	NAPA	1,489.0	77.0	5.2	4.0	6.3
15	SAN BENITO	913.7	47.3	5.2	3.7	6.7
16	CALAVERAS	307.0	16.0	5.2 *	2.7	7.8
17	PLACER	2,891.0	151.3	5.2	4.4	6.1
18	MODOC	76.3	4.0	5.2 *	0.1	10.4
19	EL DORADO	1,647.3	86.7	5.3	4.2	6.4
20	YOLO	2,178.7	115.7	5.3	4.3	6.3
21	NEVADA	762.0	40.7	5.3	3.7	7.0
22	SANTA CRUZ	3,457.3	184.7	5.3	4.6	6.1
23	INYO	186.0	10.0	5.4 *	2.0	8.7
24	LAKE	576.0	31.0	5.4	3.5	7.3
25	SONOMA	5,514.3	301.0	5.5	4.8	6.1
26	MADERA	2,046.0	112.0	5.5	4.5	6.5
27	MARIN	2,681.0	147.0	5.5	4.6	6.4
28	ORANGE	46,559.3	2,559.0	5.5	5.3	5.7
29	IMPERIAL	2,512.0	140.3	5.6	4.7	6.5
30	MONTEREY	6,809.7	381.7	5.6	5.0	6.2
31	SHASTA	1,872.0	105.0	5.6	4.5	6.7
32	VENTURA	11,596.0	656.3	5.7	5.2	6.1
33	SANTA BARBARA	5,647.3	321.0	5.7	5.1	6.3
34	SISKIYOU	445.0	25.7	5.8	3.5	8.0
35	TULARE	6,967.0	402.7	5.8	5.2	6.3
36	TUOLUMNE	432.0	25.3	5.9	3.6	8.1
37	KINGS	2,162.3	127.7	5.9	4.9	6.9
38	COLUSA	326.3	19.3	5.9	3.3	8.6
39	SAN DIEGO	43,650.0	2,611.3	6.0	5.8	6.2
40	STANISLAUS	7,094.3	425.0	6.0	5.4	6.6
41	RIVERSIDE	23,865.7	1,452.0	6.1	5.8	6.4
42	MERCED	3,687.0	224.7	6.1	5.3	6.9
43	SAN JOAQUIN	9,034.0	552.0	6.1	5.6	6.6
44	SANTA CLARA	26,845.7	1,642.7	6.1	5.8	6.4
45	SUTTER	1,150.3	71.3	6.2	4.8	7.6
46	SAN MATEO	10,228.0	637.0	6.2	5.7	6.7
	CALIFORNIA	523,530.7	32,325.7	6.2	6.1	6.2
47	KERN	11,525.3	726.0	6.3	5.8	6.8
48	SAN BERNARDINO	28,432.7	1,813.3	6.4	6.1	6.7
49	CONTRA COSTA	12,765.3	815.3	6.4	5.9	6.8
50	FRESNO	14,214.3	922.0	6.5	6.1	6.9
51	LOS ANGELES	157,380.7	10,240.0	6.5	6.4	6.6
52	SACRAMENTO	17,895.0	1,185.3	6.6	6.2	7.0
53	SOLANO	5,646.3	378.0	6.7	6.0	7.4
54	SAN FRANCISCO	8,311.0	564.0	6.8	6.2	7.3
55	ALAMEDA	21,214.3	1,443.0	6.8	6.5	7.2
56	MARIPOSA	129.0	9.0	7.0 *	2.4	11.5
57	YUBA	1,015.3	73.3	7.2	5.6	8.9
58	TRINITY	98.7	7.3	7.4 *	2.0	12.8

TABLE 22: BIRTHS TO ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Three-Year Average Age-Specific Birth Rate

The age-specific birth rate to adolescents, aged 15 to 19, in California was 50.3 per 1,000 female population, a rate equivalent to approximately one birth for every 20 adolescent females. This rate was based on the 1998 to 2000 average of 56,697.0 births and a female population for the same age group of 1,126,218 as of July 1, 1999.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the age-specific rate ranged from 82.3 in Kings County to 13.5 in Marin County, a difference in rates by a factor of 6.1 to 1.

A Year 2010 National Objective for births to adolescents aged 15 to 19 has not been established.

Notes:

* Age-specific rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-specific birth rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-specific birth rate at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated birth rate. The wider the interval, the less precise the birth rate. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the birth rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 1998-2000.

Department of Finance: 1999 Population Estimates with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2000.

TABLE 22
BIRTHS AMONG ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1999 FEMALE POPULATION 15-19 YRS OLD	1998-2000 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)	AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
	YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED					
1	MARIN	6,181	83.7	13.5	10.6	16.4
2	SIERRA	141	2.3	16.5 *	0.0	37.8
3	PLACER	8,673	187.7	21.6	18.5	24.7
4	NEVADA	3,324	72.0	21.7	16.7	26.7
5	PLUMAS	791	17.3	21.9 *	11.6	32.2
6	AMADOR	1,077	26.0	24.1	14.9	33.4
7	EL DORADO	5,768	143.7	24.9	20.8	29.0
8	SAN LUIS OBISPO	9,735	245.3	25.2	22.0	28.4
9	CALAVERAS	1,412	36.3	25.7	17.4	34.1
10	ALPINE	38	1.0	26.3 *	0.0	77.9
11	MODOC	384	10.3	26.9 *	10.5	43.3
12	SAN FRANCISCO	17,120	477.3	27.9	25.4	30.4
13	TUOLUMNE	1,772	50.7	28.6	20.7	36.5
14	YOLO	7,402	211.7	28.6	24.7	32.4
15	SAN MATEO	20,866	632.0	30.3	27.9	32.6
16	MONO	340	10.7	31.4 *	12.5	50.2
17	CONTRA COSTA	30,365	974.3	32.1	30.1	34.1
18	SONOMA	15,079	484.7	32.1	29.3	35.0
19	TRINITY	498	16.3	32.8 *	16.9	48.7
20	NAPA	3,962	131.7	33.2	27.6	38.9
21	LASSEN	1,121	40.3	36.0	24.9	47.1
22	SANTA CLARA	51,730	1,898.7	36.7	35.1	38.4
23	SISKIYOU	1,743	64.7	37.1	28.1	46.1
24	HUMBOLDT	4,634	172.3	37.2	31.6	42.7
25	ALAMEDA	44,595	1,682.0	37.7	35.9	39.5
26	SANTA CRUZ	8,806	332.3	37.7	33.7	41.8
27	MARIPOSA	527	20.7	39.2	22.3	56.1
28	BUTTE	7,141	287.0	40.2	35.5	44.8
29	SOLANO	14,692	617.0	42.0	38.7	45.3
30	VENTURA	25,761	1,087.3	42.2	39.7	44.7
31	SHASTA	6,396	273.0	42.7	37.6	47.7
32	ORANGE	82,727	3,659.7	44.2	42.8	45.7
33	SANTA BARBARA	14,274	640.7	44.9	41.4	48.4
34	MENDOCINO	3,327	150.3	45.2	38.0	52.4
35	SAN DIEGO	92,399	4,213.7	45.6	44.2	47.0
36	INYO	648	29.7	45.8	29.3	62.3
37	SUTTER	2,945	138.7	47.1	39.2	54.9
38	GLENN	1,184	56.3	47.6	35.2	60.0
39	SACRAMENTO	41,639	2,014.7	48.4	46.3	50.5
40	LAKE	1,953	96.0	49.2	39.3	59.0
	CALIFORNIA	1,126,218	56,697.0	50.3	49.9	50.8
41	DEL NORTE	1,149	62.3	54.3	40.8	67.7
42	STANISLAUS	17,918	972.7	54.3	50.9	57.7
43	SAN BENITO	1,869	103.7	55.5	44.8	66.1
44	LOS ANGELES	303,552	17,224.7	56.7	55.9	57.6
45	RIVERSIDE	55,074	3,195.0	58.0	56.0	60.0
46	TEHAMA	2,066	122.3	59.2	48.7	69.7
47	SAN JOAQUIN	21,673	1,295.7	59.8	56.5	63.0
48	COLUSA	816	49.7	60.9	43.9	77.8
49	SAN BERNARDINO	65,304	4,021.0	61.6	59.7	63.5
50	IMPERIAL	6,430	404.7	62.9	56.8	69.1
51	YUBA	2,531	164.3	64.9	55.0	74.9
52	MONTEREY	13,222	862.7	65.2	60.9	69.6
53	MERCED	9,036	607.3	67.2	61.9	72.6
54	MADERA	4,629	343.7	74.2	66.4	82.1
55	KERN	25,844	1,943.3	75.2	71.9	78.5
56	FRESNO	31,899	2,409.3	75.5	72.5	78.5
57	TULARE	15,524	1,253.3	80.7	76.3	85.2
58	KINGS	4,512	371.3	82.3	73.9	90.7

TABLE 23A: PRENATAL CARE NOT BEGUN DURING THE FIRST TRIMESTER OF PREGNANCY, 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Percentage of Three-Year Average Late/No Prenatal Care

The relative number of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care for California was 16.5 per 100 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care of 89,904.0 and a three-year average total number of live births of 515,103.3 from 1998 to 2000.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care ranged from 42.1 in Mendocino County to 10.8 in Ventura County, a difference in percentage by a factor of 3.9 to 1.

None of the 58 counties, irrespective of the "reliability" of their percentages, nor California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of not more than 10.0 percent of live births to mothers with late or no prenatal care.

Notes:

The average number of live births excludes those births with unknown prenatal care.

* Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. The wider the interval, the less precise the percent. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 1998-2000.

TABLE 23A
PRENATAL CARE NOT BEGUN DURING THE FIRST TRIMESTER OF PREGNANCY
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LATE/NO PRENATAL CARE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1998-2000 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		TOTAL NUMBER	LATE/NO PRENATAL CARE NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
		YEAR 2010	NATIONAL OBJ	10.0		
1	VENTURA	11,512.3	1,248.7	10.8	10.2	11.4
2	ALAMEDA	20,892.0	2,294.0	11.0	10.5	11.4
3	CONTRA COSTA	12,606.0	1,389.7	11.0	10.4	11.6
4	SONOMA	5,282.0	659.0	12.5	11.5	13.4
5	TUOLUMNE	431.7	54.3	12.6	9.2	15.9
6	ORANGE	46,319.7	5,974.3	12.9	12.6	13.2
7	PLACER	2,856.7	378.3	13.2	11.9	14.6
8	MARIN	2,650.0	351.7	13.3	11.9	14.7
9	SANTA CLARA	26,527.7	3,635.0	13.7	13.3	14.1
10	SHASTA	1,867.7	258.7	13.8	12.2	15.5
11	SANTA CRUZ	3,427.0	478.0	13.9	12.7	15.2
12	LOS ANGELES	155,239.0	21,694.3	14.0	13.8	14.2
13	CALAVERAS	304.0	42.7	14.0	9.8	18.2
14	SAN MATEO	10,213.7	1,440.3	14.1	13.4	14.8
15	SAN FRANCISCO	8,263.0	1,171.3	14.2	13.4	15.0
16	EL DORADO	1,635.3	233.7	14.3	12.5	16.1
17	AMADOR	251.7	36.7	14.6	9.9	19.3
18	SAN BENITO	902.7	134.0	14.8	12.3	17.4
19	PLUMAS	137.3	22.7	16.5	9.7	23.3
	CALIFORNIA	515,103.3	84,904.0	16.5	16.4	16.6
20	FRESNO	14,102.0	2,339.0	16.6	15.9	17.3
21	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,369.7	411.7	17.4	15.7	19.1
22	TEHAMA	654.7	114.7	17.5	14.3	20.7
23	SISKIYOU	436.7	78.0	17.9	13.9	21.8
24	KERN	10,723.0	1,924.7	17.9	17.1	18.8
25	SAN DIEGO	42,798.7	7,795.0	18.2	17.8	18.6
26	STANISLAUS	7,036.3	1,284.0	18.2	17.2	19.2
27	HUMBOLDT	1,407.0	264.3	18.8	16.5	21.1
28	LASSEN	279.0	54.7	19.6	14.4	24.8
29	NEVADA	759.0	150.0	19.8	16.6	22.9
30	MADERA	2,038.0	410.7	20.2	18.2	22.1
31	DEL NORTE	309.3	63.7	20.6	15.5	25.6
32	SANTA BARBARA	5,619.7	1,164.0	20.7	19.5	21.9
33	RIVERSIDE	23,591.0	4,922.0	20.9	20.3	21.4
34	SACRAMENTO	17,600.0	3,701.0	21.0	20.4	21.7
35	KINGS	2,153.0	454.7	21.1	19.2	23.1
36	MONTEREY	6,777.7	1,441.7	21.3	20.2	22.4
37	SAN BERNARDINO	27,885.3	6,159.3	22.1	21.5	22.6
38	TRINITY	98.7	22.3	22.6	13.2	32.0
39	MONO	127.0	29.0	22.8	14.5	31.1
40	IMPERIAL	2,459.0	589.3	24.0	22.0	25.9
41	TULARE	6,619.7	1,616.3	24.4	23.2	25.6
42	MODOC	75.7	19.0	25.1	13.8	36.4
43	SOLANO	4,856.7	1,247.0	25.7	24.3	27.1
44	NAPA	1,346.3	353.7	26.3	23.5	29.0
45	BUTTE	2,235.0	596.3	26.7	24.5	28.8
46	YOLO	2,150.3	582.3	27.1	24.9	29.3
47	SAN JOAQUIN	8,814.0	2,528.0	28.7	27.6	29.8
48	LAKE	569.0	163.7	28.8	24.4	33.2
49	INYO	185.3	55.3	29.9	22.0	37.7
50	GLENN	383.3	114.7	29.9	24.4	35.4
51	MARIPOSA	125.7	38.3	30.5	20.8	40.2
52	SUTTER	1,147.7	395.7	34.5	31.1	37.9
53	SIERRA	17.3	6.0	34.6 *	6.9	62.3
54	COLUSA	325.7	121.3	37.3	30.6	43.9
55	MERCED	3,632.3	1,365.3	37.6	35.6	39.6
56	YUBA	1,013.0	382.7	37.8	34.0	41.6
57	ALPINE	12.0	4.7	38.9 *	3.6	74.2
58	MENDOCINO	1,050.3	442.7	42.1	38.2	46.1

TABLE 23B: "ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE (ADEQUACY OF PRENATAL CARE UTILIZATION INDEX), 1998-2000

California Counties Ranked By Percentage of Three-Year Average
"Adequate/Adequate Plus" Prenatal Care

The relative number of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care for California was 75.8 per 100 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care of 383,027.3 and a three-year average total number of live births of 505,277.7 from 1998 to 2000.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care ranged from 84.5 in Ventura County to 54.6 in Trinity County, a difference in percentage by a factor of 1.5 to 1.

None of the 58 counties, irrespective of the "reliability" of their percentages, nor California as a whole, met the Year 2010 National Objective of at least 90.0 percent of all live births to mothers who received "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care according to the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index.

Notes:

The average total number of live births excludes "unknown" adequacy of prenatal care. The definition of "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care includes mothers who initiated prenatal care by the fourth month of pregnancy and had greater than or equal to 80 percent of the expected number of prenatal care visits recommended by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

* Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

Counties were rank ordered first by decreasing percentage of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. The wider the interval, the less precise the percent. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 1998-2000.

TABLE 23B
"ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE (ADEQUACY OF PRENATAL CARE UTILIZATION INDEX)
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE "ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1998-2000 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		TOTAL NUMBER	ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS CARE		LOWER	UPPER
			NUMBER	PERCENT		
		YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			90.0	
1	VENTURA	11,470.3	9,688.0	84.5	82.8	86.1
2	FRESNO	14,034.0	11,680.7	83.2	81.7	84.7
3	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,355.7	1,947.0	82.7	79.0	86.3
4	PLACER	2,713.0	2,217.7	81.7	78.3	85.1
5	MARIN	2,635.3	2,121.3	80.5	77.1	83.9
6	LASSEN	279.0	224.3	80.4	69.9	90.9
7	SAN MATEO	10,205.7	8,200.7	80.4	78.6	82.1
8	MONO	126.7	101.3	80.0	64.4	95.6
9	ALAMEDA	20,632.0	16,497.3	80.0	78.7	81.2
10	EL DORADO	1,599.7	1,277.3	79.8	75.5	84.2
11	ORANGE	45,733.7	36,246.3	79.3	78.4	80.1
12	LOS ANGELES	150,890.7	118,510.7	78.5	78.1	79.0
13	DEL NORTE	307.3	240.7	78.3	68.4	88.2
14	CONTRA COSTA	12,508.7	9,673.0	77.3	75.8	78.9
15	SAN FRANCISCO	8,188.7	6,305.7	77.0	75.1	78.9
16	TEHAMA	652.7	500.0	76.6	69.9	83.3
17	GLENN	382.0	291.7	76.4	67.6	85.1
18	KINGS	2,149.3	1,639.7	76.3	72.6	80.0
19	SANTA BARBARA	5,608.7	4,263.3	76.0	73.7	78.3
	CALIFORNIA	505,277.7	383,027.3	75.8	75.6	76.0
20	SANTA CRUZ	3,388.0	2,540.3	75.0	72.1	77.9
21	TUOLUMNE	431.3	322.7	74.8	66.6	83.0
22	BUTTE	2,224.7	1,659.3	74.6	71.0	78.2
23	SACRAMENTO	16,921.3	12,616.0	74.6	73.3	75.9
24	KERN	9,828.0	7,327.3	74.6	72.8	76.3
25	SHASTA	1,863.0	1,388.3	74.5	70.6	78.4
26	SANTA CLARA	26,493.3	19,524.7	73.7	72.7	74.7
27	INYO	185.0	135.3	73.2	60.8	85.5
28	MONTEREY	6,747.7	4,926.7	73.0	71.0	75.1
29	SISKIYOU	423.0	307.0	72.6	64.5	80.7
30	SONOMA	4,856.3	3,518.0	72.4	70.0	74.8
31	AMADOR	250.0	181.0	72.4	61.9	82.9
32	CALAVERAS	303.0	219.0	72.3	62.7	81.8
33	ALPINE	12.0	8.7	72.2 *	24.1	100.0
34	SAN DIEGO	42,458.3	30,600.0	72.1	71.3	72.9
35	SAN BERNARDINO	26,970.0	19,378.0	71.9	70.8	72.9
36	SIERRA	17.3	12.3	71.2 *	31.4	100.0
37	NAPA	1,333.7	944.3	70.8	66.3	75.3
38	TULARE	6,600.0	4,631.3	70.2	68.2	72.2
39	MADERA	2,030.0	1,423.0	70.1	66.5	73.7
40	RIVERSIDE	23,463.7	16,379.7	69.8	68.7	70.9
41	PLUMAS	137.3	95.3	69.4	55.5	83.4
42	NEVADA	753.3	522.7	69.4	63.4	75.3
43	SOLANO	4,816.3	3,270.7	67.9	65.6	70.2
44	SUTTER	1,142.3	768.0	67.2	62.5	72.0
45	STANISLAUS	6,944.7	4,635.7	66.8	64.8	68.7
46	HUMBOLDT	1,387.3	925.3	66.7	62.4	71.0
47	MODOC	74.3	49.3	66.4	47.8	84.9
48	YOLO	2,105.0	1,374.0	65.3	61.8	68.7
49	IMPERIAL	2,345.3	1,529.3	65.2	61.9	68.5
50	COLUSA	325.0	209.7	64.5	55.8	73.2
51	SAN JOAQUIN	8,616.7	5,547.0	64.4	62.7	66.1
52	LAKE	563.3	359.3	63.8	57.2	70.4
53	YUBA	1,005.7	628.7	62.5	57.6	67.4
54	SAN BENITO	902.3	549.0	60.8	55.8	65.9
55	MENDOCINO	1,043.3	627.3	60.1	55.4	64.8
56	MARIPOSA	125.3	75.3	60.1	46.5	73.7
57	MERCED	3,619.0	2,137.3	59.1	56.6	61.6
58	TRINITY	98.3	53.7	54.6	40.0	69.2

TABLE 24: BREASTFEEDING INITIATION DURING EARLY POSTPARTUM, 1998-2000

The relative number of breastfed infants for California was 81.2 per 100 hospital births. This percentage was based on the 410,300.0 breastfed infants among 505,482.7 hospital births, the three-year average from 1998 to 2000. Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of breastfed infants ranged from 93.7 in Santa Cruz County to 70.8 in Kings County, a difference in percentage by a factor of 1.3 to 1.

Altogether 53 counties (51 with reliable percentages) and California as a whole met the Year 2010 National Objective of at least 75.0 percent of all infants breastfed during the early postpartum period.

Notes:

Breastfeeding initiation includes: exclusively breastfed infants; and combination breastfed and formula fed infants. The data include only births occurring in a California hospital. The average number of total hospital births excludes those of unknown feeding type.

* Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

County of residence is derived from the patient's zip code. When the zip code was not present the county of hospital was substituted. Counties were rank ordered first by decreasing percentage of breastfed infants (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of hospital births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23% are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of breastfed infants at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. The wider the interval, the less precise the percent. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program.

TABLE 24
BREASTFEEDING INITIATION DURING EARLY POSTPARTUM
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BREASTFEEDING INITIATION PERCENTAGE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	1998-2000 HOSPITAL BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		TOTAL NUMBER	BREASTFED NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
1	SANTA CRUZ	3,458.0	3,239.3	93.7	90.5	96.9
2	NEVADA	764.7	711.7	93.1	86.2	99.9
3	MARIN	2,757.7	2,556.0	92.7	89.1	96.3
4	PLUMAS	131.3	121.3	92.4	75.9	100.0
5	TRINITY	99.3	91.7	92.3	73.4	100.0
6	ALPINE	12.7	11.7	92.1 *	39.3	100.0
7	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,378.3	2,187.3	92.0	88.1	95.8
8	MONTEREY	6,414.3	5,889.7	91.8	89.5	94.2
9	SAN MATEO	9,297.7	8,531.7	91.8	89.8	93.7
10	SONOMA	5,170.7	4,733.3	91.5	88.9	94.1
11	NAPA	1,378.7	1,255.3	91.1	86.0	96.1
12	INYO	262.3	237.7	90.6	79.1	100.0
13	GLENN	252.7	227.7	90.1	78.4	100.0
14	MONO	69.3	62.3	89.9	67.6	100.0
15	PLACER	2,527.3	2,266.3	89.7	86.0	93.4
16	HUMBOLDT	1,387.3	1,243.3	89.6	84.6	94.6
17	EL DORADO	1,566.0	1,401.7	89.5	84.8	94.2
18	SANTA CLARA	27,310.0	24,418.0	89.4	88.3	90.5
19	SANTA BARBARA	5,491.3	4,901.3	89.3	86.8	91.8
20	LASSEN	235.0	209.7	89.2	77.1	100.0
21	MENDOCINO	1,051.3	937.7	89.2	83.5	94.9
22	DEL NORTE	319.7	284.7	89.1	78.7	99.4
23	SHASTA	1,803.3	1,600.0	88.7	84.4	93.1
24	MODOC	54.7	48.3	88.4	63.5	100.0
25	SISKIYOU	310.0	272.0	87.7	77.3	98.2
26	TUOLUMNE	481.0	420.7	87.5	79.1	95.8
27	YOLO	2,131.0	1,863.3	87.4	83.5	91.4
28	SIERRA	15.3	13.3	87.0 *	40.3	100.0
29	CONTRA COSTA	12,594.3	10,943.7	86.9	85.3	88.5
30	VENTURA	10,890.7	9,457.0	86.8	85.1	88.6
31	SAN DIEGO	38,536.7	33,457.0	86.8	85.9	87.7
32	SAN BENITO	845.3	727.7	86.1	79.8	92.3
33	MARIPOSA	116.7	100.3	86.0	69.2	100.0
34	SAN FRANCISCO	8,434.3	7,200.7	85.4	83.4	87.3
35	BUTTE	2,258.0	1,926.7	85.3	81.5	89.1
36	ALAMEDA	20,861.0	17,786.3	85.3	84.0	86.5
37	AMADOR	258.3	217.7	84.3	73.1	95.5
38	TEHAMA	636.7	533.3	83.8	76.7	90.9
39	CALAVERAS	256.7	211.7	82.5	71.4	93.6
40	ORANGE	45,330.3	37,379.7	82.5	81.6	83.3
41	SOLANO	5,267.0	4,334.0	82.3	79.8	84.7
42	LAKE	544.0	443.7	81.6	74.0	89.1
43	COLUSA	314.0	255.0	81.2	71.2	91.2
	CALIFORNIA	505,482.7	410,300.0	81.2	80.9	81.4
44	SUTTER	1,186.0	946.0	79.8	74.7	84.8
45	SACRAMENTO	17,245.3	13,576.0	78.7	77.4	80.0
46	SAN JOAQUIN	8,790.3	6,905.7	78.6	76.7	80.4
47	TULARE	6,471.3	5,022.7	77.6	75.5	79.8
48	MERCED	3,458.0	2,677.3	77.4	74.5	80.4
49	LOS ANGELES	155,658.3	120,504.0	77.4	77.0	77.9
50	FRESNO	13,751.0	10,583.3	77.0	75.5	78.4
51	MADERA	2,025.3	1,538.0	75.9	72.1	79.7
52	STANISLAUS	6,975.0	5,274.3	75.6	73.6	77.7
53	RIVERSIDE	22,567.3	17,018.0	75.4	74.3	76.5
	YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			75.0		
54	KERN	10,881.0	8,100.0	74.4	72.8	76.1
55	IMPERIAL	2,509.7	1,860.7	74.1	70.8	77.5
56	SAN BERNARDINO	26,933.3	19,627.0	72.9	71.9	73.9
57	YUBA	863.3	615.3	71.3	65.6	76.9
58	KINGS	1,892.3	1,340.3	70.8	67.0	74.6

TABLE 25: PERSONS UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY, 1990 CENSUS

California Counties Ranked By Percentage of Census Population Under 18 Below Poverty

The relative number of persons under age 18 who were in poverty in California was 18.2 per 100 population under age 18. This percentage was based on the 1990 Census.

All 58 counties had "reliable" percentages of persons under 18 years of age below poverty. The percents ranged from 33.2 in Tulare County to 6.3 in Marin County, a difference in percentage by a factor of 5.3 to 1.

A Year 2010 National Objective for the percentage of persons under age 18 who are below poverty has not been established.

Notes:

Percentages are based on the population under 18 years of age for which the poverty status was determined and excludes persons of unknown poverty status.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of persons under 18 in poverty (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the same age group population. The upper and lower limits of the percent of persons under 18 years of age in poverty at the 95% confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. The wider the interval, the less precise the percentage. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the estimated percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 63 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Finance: State Census Data Center, 1990 Census, Summary Tape File P117/118.

TABLE 25
PERSONS UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF CENSUS POPULATION UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1990

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	UNDER 18			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		1990 POPULATION	IN POVERTY		LOWER	UPPER
			NUMBER	PERCENT		
	YEAR 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED					
1	MARIN	43,099	2,728	6.3	6.1	6.6
2	SAN MATEO	138,532	11,207	8.1	7.9	8.2
3	PLACER	44,502	4,064	9.1	8.9	9.4
4	SIERRA	710	67	9.4	7.2	11.7
5	SONOMA	93,032	8,989	9.7	9.5	9.9
6	NAPA	25,234	2,442	9.7	9.3	10.1
7	EL DORADO	32,426	3,281	10.1	9.8	10.5
8	VENTURA	178,737	18,305	10.2	10.1	10.4
9	NEVADA	18,427	1,915	10.4	9.9	10.9
10	SANTA CLARA	349,495	36,759	10.5	10.4	10.6
11	SOLANO	95,907	10,153	10.6	10.4	10.8
12	CONTRA COSTA	197,901	21,904	11.1	10.9	11.2
13	MONO	2,360	264	11.2	9.8	12.5
14	ORANGE	573,127	65,463	11.4	11.3	11.5
15	SANTA CRUZ	52,656	6,280	11.9	11.6	12.2
16	AMADOR	5,506	676	12.3	11.4	13.2
17	SAN BENITO	11,265	1,453	12.9	12.2	13.6
18	SAN LUIS OBISPO	46,527	6,232	13.4	13.1	13.7
19	TUOLUMNE	10,656	1,435	13.5	12.8	14.2
20	MARIPOSA	3,130	455	14.5	13.2	15.9
21	ALAMEDA	297,681	45,747	15.4	15.2	15.5
22	SANTA BARBARA	83,327	12,829	15.4	15.1	15.7
23	RIVERSIDE	326,377	51,608	15.8	15.7	15.9
24	CALAVERAS	7,693	1,222	15.9	15.0	16.8
25	SAN DIEGO	596,807	96,720	16.2	16.1	16.3
26	MONTEREY	95,470	16,255	17.0	16.8	17.3
27	INYO	4,395	753	17.1	15.9	18.4
28	COLUSA	4,948	858	17.3	16.2	18.5
29	YOLO	32,928	5,774	17.5	17.1	18.0
30	LASSEN	6,641	1,176	17.7	16.7	18.7
31	SAN BERNARDINO	429,107	76,768	17.9	17.8	18.0
	CALIFORNIA	7,563,329	1,380,275	18.2	18.2	18.3
32	SAN FRANCISCO	114,074	21,228	18.6	18.4	18.9
33	PLUMAS	4,971	976	19.6	18.4	20.9
34	SACRAMENTO	268,085	53,348	19.9	19.7	20.1
35	SHASTA	38,939	8,030	20.6	20.2	21.1
36	MENDOCINO	21,267	4,468	21.0	20.4	21.6
37	MODOC	2,550	536	21.0	19.2	22.8
38	STANISLAUS	110,597	23,353	21.1	20.8	21.4
39	SISKIYOU	11,358	2,413	21.2	20.4	22.1
40	LOS ANGELES	2,268,176	496,504	21.9	21.8	22.0
41	LAKE	11,798	2,729	23.1	22.3	24.0
42	HUMBOLDT	29,905	6,918	23.1	22.6	23.7
43	SUTTER	18,003	4,195	23.3	22.6	24.0
44	SAN JOAQUIN	138,154	32,725	23.7	23.4	23.9
45	BUTTE	41,735	10,142	24.3	23.8	24.8
46	TEHAMA	12,881	3,132	24.3	23.5	25.2
47	KERN	167,206	41,417	24.8	24.5	25.0
48	DEL NORTE	6,138	1,528	24.9	23.6	26.1
49	MADERA	26,808	6,817	25.4	24.8	26.0
50	GLENN	7,368	1,939	26.3	25.1	27.5
51	KINGS	30,207	8,146	27.0	26.4	27.6
52	TRINITY	3,416	939	27.5	25.7	29.2
53	MERCED	59,438	17,853	30.0	29.6	30.5
54	YUBA	17,828	5,369	30.1	29.3	30.9
55	IMPERIAL	37,254	11,576	31.1	30.5	31.6
56	FRESNO	204,757	66,416	32.4	32.2	32.7
57	ALPINE	271	89	32.8	26.0	39.7
58	TULARE	101,542	33,707	33.2	32.8	33.5

TABLE 26
A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE RATES AND PERCENTAGES
AMONG SELECTED HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

COUNTY	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES		MORBIDITY RATE		MORBIDITY RATE	
	ALL CAUSES OF DEATH (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ¹		REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS (AGES 13 AND OVER) (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ²		TUBERCULOSIS CRUDE RATES (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ²	
	1995-1997	1998-2000	1995-1997	1998-2000	1995-1997	1998-2000
CALIFORNIA	821.9	773.8	37.0	21.3	13.4	10.5
ALAMEDA	835.7	785.5	41.1	25.2	17.4	16.5
ALPINE	589.0 *	657.2 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
AMADOR	794.5	716.9	12.5 *	13.0 *	2.0 *	1.9 *
BUTTE	840.2	779.7	10.0 *	7.0 *	3.9 *	2.0 *
CALAVERAS	797.9	724.0	8.1 *	3.1 *	0.0 +	0.8 *
COLUSA	816.2	725.4	7.8 *	0.0 +	7.3 *	1.7 *
CONTRA COSTA	825.4	769.8	23.4	11.1	12.5	10.0
DEL NORTE	851.7	776.2	13.0 *	4.4 *	1.2 *	2.2 *
EL DORADO	781.0	724.7	12.4 *	4.7 *	2.3 *	1.7 *
FRESNO	822.9	814.6	19.0	11.6	10.1	12.7
GLENN	849.4	798.6	3.5 *	1.7 *	3.7 *	1.2 *
HUMBOLDT	926.2	925.7	12.7 *	8.2 *	6.7 *	7.6 *
IMPERIAL	749.7	699.6	13.8 *	4.6 *	27.6	22.8
INYO	872.6	734.3	11.8 *	2.4 *	0.0 +	1.8 *
KERN	868.5	836.0	24.1	16.9	11.4	8.0
KINGS	921.4	873.3	19.1 *	26.2	18.1	9.7 *
LAKE	941.8	856.5	27.4 *	15.5 *	7.3 *	3.4 *
LASSEN	674.3	648.6	30.1 *	15.1 *	3.1 *	1.9 *
LOS ANGELES	821.6	769.1	47.1	26.6	16.7	13.0
MADERA	803.6	755.9	9.5 *	9.0 *	9.4 *	8.2 *
MARIN	797.0	727.6	54.3	28.9	7.0 *	5.5 *
MARIPOSA	794.6	736.6	10.5 *	7.7 *	0.0 +	4.1 *
MENDOCINO	932.2	839.6	17.3 *	9.0 *	1.6 *	3.4 *
MERCED	910.0	852.2	9.8 *	6.3 *	7.9 *	4.6 *
MODOC	868.7	750.6	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	6.4 *
MONO	512.1 *	474.7 *	4.1 *	4.0 *	0.0 +	0.0 +
MONTEREY	806.5	737.7	27.0	12.0	12.4	11.0
NAPA	846.0	788.9	15.7 *	8.0 *	5.9 *	2.9 *
NEVADA	696.6	655.5	16.0 *	8.5 *	0.0 +	1.4 *
ORANGE	809.4	785.8	21.3	15.5	11.8	9.4
PLACER	824.4	795.0	13.2	2.5 *	2.2 *	1.3 *
PLUMAS	812.8	743.4	8.4 *	2.0 *	8.2 *	1.6 *
RIVERSIDE	808.5	776.2	38.4	25.5	6.2	4.9
SACRAMENTO	914.3	867.0	27.5	18.2	12.3	9.2
SAN BENITO	652.2	636.1	10.6 *	7.5 *	5.3 *	6.7 *
SAN BERNARDINO	940.7	906.4	18.7	12.0	8.1	6.3
SAN DIEGO	819.2	769.3	47.5	25.4	14.3	10.7
SAN FRANCISCO	827.5	698.4	215.0	115.8	33.6	25.9
SAN JOAQUIN	843.6	818.8	15.6	11.9	13.4	12.4
SAN LUIS OBISPO	768.5	709.9	28.4	11.7	4.9 *	4.2 *
SAN MATEO	729.3	662.5	19.8	11.6	12.6	8.5
SANTA BARBARA	733.2	717.2	14.9	8.0	14.2	6.5
SANTA CLARA	752.4	696.9	18.8	10.9	17.1	14.0
SANTA CRUZ	757.4	692.5	20.0	13.7	8.1	3.9 *
SHASTA	956.4	887.4	10.0 *	3.4 *	3.7 *	2.7 *
SIERRA	571.6 *	624.4 *	12.2 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
SISKIYOU	958.4	817.3	20.8 *	5.8 *	1.5 *	3.0 *
SOLANO	928.8	866.7	36.0	28.5	15.1	9.3
SONOMA	824.3	777.8	30.6	13.0	4.3 *	3.7 *
STANISLAUS	913.0	880.0	13.1	9.6	8.0	5.7
SUTTER	853.2	807.7	9.3 *	6.3 *	12.1 *	7.9 *
TEHAMA	887.1	863.6	3.3 *	4.0 *	7.4 *	3.0 *
TRINITY	969.8	896.1	6.5 *	3.2 *	7.5 *	0.0 +
TULARE	878.9	818.8	8.1	6.9 *	9.5	5.9
TUOLUMNE	802.3	791.2	12.3 *	9.3 *	0.6 *	6.1 *
VENTURA	756.8	755.7	13.7	8.2	10.4	7.3
YOLO	869.5	811.9	13.0 *	7.8 *	8.5 *	5.4 *
YUBA	987.5	1,045.2	8.1 *	7.7 *	10.5 *	11.1 *

TABLE 26 (continued)
A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE RATES AND PERCENTAGES
AMONG SELECTED HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

COUNTY	PERCENT		MORTALITY RATE		PERCENT	
	ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS PRENATAL CARE (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ^o		INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ^o		LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ^o	
	1995-1997	1998-2000	1993-1995	1996, 1997, 1999	1995-1997	1998-2000
CALIFORNIA	67.1	75.8	6.8	5.8	6.1	6.2
ALAMEDA	74.4	80.0	6.1	6.1	6.9	6.8
ALPINE	75.0 *	72.2 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
AMADOR	73.0	72.4	5.0 *	6.1 *	4.9 *	5.1 *
BUTTE	66.6	74.6	9.1	6.2 *	4.9	5.0
CALAVERAS	71.2	72.3	14.3 *	4.1 *	5.8	5.2 *
COLUSA	56.0	64.5	8.2 *	5.3 *	5.5 *	5.9
CONTRA COSTA	68.0	77.3	5.9	5.6	6.2	6.4
DEL NORTE	65.6	78.3	12.9 *	8.4 *	5.5 *	4.6 *
EL DORADO	73.5	79.8	5.7 *	4.0 *	6.2	5.3
FRESNO	75.6	83.2	8.5	7.6	6.6	6.5
GLENN	64.8	76.4	3.8 *	4.8 *	4.1 *	5.0
HUMBOLDT	55.0	66.7	10.3 *	5.4 *	4.6	4.8
IMPERIAL	66.4	65.2	5.6 *	5.3 *	4.7	5.6
INYO	65.5	73.2	9.1 *	10.0 *	6.8 *	5.4 *
KERN	56.9	74.6	11.0	7.4	6.4	6.3
KINGS	65.5	76.3	8.4 *	7.9 *	5.9	5.9
LAKE	55.9	63.8	7.1 *	8.1 *	5.7	5.4
LASSEN	73.3	80.4	7.6 *	3.3 *	4.7 *	4.6 *
LOS ANGELES	67.6	78.5	7.0	5.9	6.4	6.5
MADERA	70.9	70.1	7.9 *	6.7 *	5.3	5.5
MARIN	79.3	80.5	4.5 *	4.5 *	5.4	5.5
MARIPOSA	62.0	60.1	2.0 *	4.8 *	6.1 *	7.0 *
MENDOCINO	51.3	60.1	9.5 *	7.2 *	5.1	4.0
MERCED	57.6	59.1	7.6	6.7	6.1	6.1
MODOC	50.0	66.4	8.0 *	14.3 *	5.7 *	5.2 *
MONO	74.1	80.0	2.5 *	0.0 +	7.0 *	4.2 *
MONTEREY	63.9	73.0	6.2	5.7	5.2	5.6
NAPA	61.8	70.8	6.0 *	5.1 *	4.2	5.2
NEVADA	60.7	69.4	5.1 *	6.8 *	5.4	5.3
ORANGE	70.1	79.3	5.8	4.7	5.3	5.5
PLACER	72.3	81.7	6.1 *	3.2 *	4.9	5.2
PLUMAS	64.8	69.4	10.7 *	4.5 *	4.9 *	2.9 *
RIVERSIDE	63.4	69.8	7.8	5.9	6.1	6.1
SACRAMENTO	64.0	74.6	7.7	6.8	6.5	6.6
SAN BENITO	46.7	60.8	4.3 *	5.6 *	4.6	5.2
SAN BERNARDINO	60.1	71.9	8.0	6.7	6.7	6.4
SAN DIEGO	68.3	72.1	6.0	5.6	5.7	6.0
SAN FRANCISCO	76.8	77.0	5.8	4.4	6.8	6.8
SAN JOAQUIN	59.2	64.4	7.2	7.2	6.5	6.1
SAN LUIS OBISPO	80.3	82.7	6.4 *	5.3 *	5.1	5.0
SAN MATEO	72.0	80.4	4.2	4.5	5.8	6.2
SANTA BARBARA	69.7	76.0	6.2	4.2	5.9	5.7
SANTA CLARA	64.2	73.7	5.6	5.0	6.0	6.1
SANTA CRUZ	62.3	75.0	6.0	5.7	4.7	5.3
SHASTA	66.1	74.5	7.3 *	6.6 *	5.1	5.6
SIERRA	60.8 *	71.2 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	1.7 *
SISKIYOU	63.6	72.6	5.5 *	3.5 *	6.3	5.8
SOLANO	56.1	67.9	7.2	6.0	6.3	6.7
SONOMA	67.4	72.4	5.3	4.5	5.3	5.5
STANISLAUS	60.2	66.8	6.7	6.6	6.2	6.0
SUTTER	68.8	67.2	6.8 *	8.0 *	5.7	6.2
TEHAMA	68.5	76.6	7.4 *	2.6 *	5.5	5.1
TRINITY	51.9	54.6	7.9 *	3.0 *	5.9 *	7.4 *
TULARE	61.5	70.2	6.3	6.8	5.5	5.8
TUOLUMNE	79.5	74.8	5.6 *	9.5 *	5.3	5.9
VENTURA	78.1	84.5	5.1	6.4	5.5	5.7
YOLO	60.1	65.3	7.0 *	6.9 *	5.5	5.3
YUBA	62.6	62.5	7.6 *	6.7 *	6.3	7.2

* Age-adjusted death rates are per 100,000 population.

- Crude case rates are per 100,000 population.

- Low birthweight and prenatal care percentages are per 100 live births.

- Birth cohort rates are per 1,000 live births.

* Rate or percent unreliable; relative standard error greater than or equal to 23%.

+ Standard error indeterminate; rate or percent based on no (zero) events.

Source: Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics: Birth and Death Statistical Master Files, 1995-2000; and Birth Cohort Files, 1993-1997, 1999.

Department of Health Services, Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry.

Department of Finance: Intercensal Estimates of California Population, July 1996; 1999 Race/Ethnic Population by County with Age.

TECHNICAL NOTES

DATA SOURCES

The California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics, Office of Vital Records, was the source for the birth and death data that appear in this report. These data were tabulated from the Birth and Death Statistical Master Files for the years 1998 through 2000, and from the linked births-deaths in the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files for the years 1996, 1997, and 1999, which are based on the Statistical Master Files. The California Department of Health Services, Division of Communicable Disease Control, Office of Statistics and Surveillance, was the source for the reported case incidence of measles, tuberculosis, hepatitis C, chlamydia, and primary and secondary syphilis. Incidence data of diagnosed AIDS cases were provided by the California Department of Health Services, Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry. Breastfeeding incidence data were provided by the California Department of Health Services, Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program.

The population data are provided on the Internet web site of the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit and Census Data Center and are the same data referenced in other Center for Health Statistics reports as released in December 1998. The 1999 population data used in this report were the Race/Ethnic Population by County with Age and Sex Detail, May 2000. The number and percentage of the population under 18 years of age who were below poverty level were tabulated from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census, Summary Tape File 3.

DATA DEFINITIONS

Mortality (Tables 1-13):

A consistent use of the consensus set of health status indicators has been facilitated by reference to the causes of mortality coded according to the International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10). This change in cause of death coding began with 1999 mortality data in the 2001 *Profiles* report and will continue in future *Profiles* reports until such time as there is another revision to the International Classification of Diseases.

In *Profiles* reports from 1993 through 2000, the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) was used for coding cause of death. This change in coding is a worldwide standard created by the World Health Organization. In the United States the National Center for Health Statistics sets the standards for implementation of the ICD-10. The National Center for Health Statistics publication, *A Guide to State Implementation of ICD-10 for Mortality*, examines differences between the 9th and 10th revision:

“ICD-10 differs from ICD-9 in a number of respects: (1) ICD-10 is far more detailed than ICD-9, about 8,000 categories compared with 4,000 categories; (2) ICD-10 uses 4-digit alphanumeric codes compared with 4-digit numeric codes in ICD-9, (3) Cause-of-death titles have been changed, and conditions have been regrouped. (4) Some coding rules have been changed.”

Therefore, readers and users of these data should be cautioned that mortality tables prior to 1999 are not necessarily comparable to those from 1999 forward, and should not be used to create trend data.

Following is a list of the mortality tables in this report and the ICD-10 codes used to create these tables.

Table 1:	All Causes of Death	A00-Y89
Table 2:	Motor Vehicle Crashes.....	VO2-V04, V09.0, V09.2, V12-V14, V19.0-V19.2, V19.4-V19.6, V20-V79, V80.3-V80.5, V81.0-V81.1, V82.0-V82.1, V83-V86, V87.0-V87.8, V88.0-V88.8, V89.0, V89.2
Table 3:	Unintentional Injuries	V01-X59, Y85-Y86
Table 4:	Firearm – related Deaths	W32-W34, X72-X74, X93-X95, Y22-Y24, Y35.0
Table 5:	Homicides	X85-Y09, Y87.1
Table 6:	Suicides	X60-X84, Y87.0
Table 7:	All Cancers.....	C00-C97
Table 8:	Lung Cancer	C33-C34
Table 9:	Female Breast Cancer	C50
Table 10:	Coronary (Ischemic) Heart Disease	I11, I20-I25
Table 11:	Cerebrovascular Disease.....	I60-I69
Table 12:	Drug-Related Deaths	F11.0-F11.5, F11.7-F11.9, F12.0-F12.5, F12.7-F12.9, F13.0-F13.5, F13.7- F13.9, F14.0-F14.5, F14.7-F14.9, F15.0- F15.5, F15.7-F15.9, F16.0-F16.5, F16.7- F16.9, F17.0-F17.5, F17.7-F17.9, F18.0-F18.5, F18.7-F18.9, ... F19.0- F19.5, F19.7-F19.9, X40- X44, X60-X64, X85, Y10- Y14
Table 13:	Diabetes Deaths	E10-E14

The cardiovascular disease health indicator has been divided into coronary heart disease and cerebrovascular disease (stroke), because Year 2010 National Health Objectives have been separately established for these two diagnostic groups.

Morbidity (Tables 14-19): In general, the case definition of a disease is in terms of laboratory test results, or in the absence of a laboratory test, a constellation of clearly specified signs and symptoms that meet a series of clinical criteria.

The original case definition for acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) is contained in the *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)*, Supplement 1S, Volume 36, August

14, 1987. The 1993 revised classification system for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection and the expanded surveillance case definition for AIDS is in the *MMWR*, Volume 41, Number RR-17, December 18, 1992. Original case definitions for measles, syphilis, and tuberculosis are contained in the *MMWR, Recommendations and Reports*, Volume 39, Number RR-13, October 19, 1990.

Caution in interpretation of morbidity tables is advised due to incomplete reporting of infectious and communicable diseases by many health care providers. Many factors contribute to the underreporting of these diseases. These factors include: lack of awareness regarding disease surveillance; lack of follow-up on support staff assigned to report; failure to perform diagnostic lab tests to confirm or rule out infectious etiology; concern for anonymity of the client; or expedited treatment in lieu of waiting for laboratory results because of time or cost constraints.

All vital events are subject to the vagaries of reporting. This fact forms the basis for the argument supporting the concept of sampling error in vital statistics. The problem of the uncertainty of reporting all events can be especially true for morbidity data. Therefore, the headings of the tables on AIDS, measles, tuberculosis, hepatitis C, chlamydia, and syphilis emphasize that the data show only reported number of cases. For more complete and technical definitions of types of morbidity, contact the Division of Communicable Disease Control or the Office of AIDS.

Birth Cohort Infant Mortality (Tables 20A-20E): The infant mortality rate is the number of deaths among infants under one year of age per 1,000 live births. It is a universally accepted and easily understood indicator, which represents the overall health status of a community. Studies of infant mortality, in which race is reported on birth certificates independently from death certificates, show that infant death rates based on these data may underestimate the infant death rates for infants of all race/ethnic groups and especially for certain race/ethnic groups. Infant mortality rates for race/ethnic groups in this report are based on linked birth and infant death records in the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, which generate more accurate estimates of the total number of infant deaths as well as more accurate race-specific infant mortality rates.

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using the data years 1996, 1997 and 1999. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

Since delayed birth and death certificate data are included in the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files after the Birth and Death Statistical Master Files have been closed to further processing, cohort files cannot be as timely as the Statistical Master Files. However, the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files are more complete. Effective with the 1999 file, a new linkage procedure was utilized that permits the cohort files to be completed nearly a year earlier than was previously possible. However, the 1999 cohort file used in this report was a preliminary file. A slightly higher infant mortality rate may result from data based on the final file, which was not available at the time this report was prepared.

Race/Ethnicity (Tables 20A-20E): The four groups, based on mother's race/ethnicity, are mutually exclusive and all inclusive categories. They are also consistent for the most part with those used by the State Census Data Center, Department of Finance, for compiling 1999 population estimates.

The mother's Hispanic origin is determined first, irrespective of race, and then second, the race categories for the remaining non-Hispanics are determined. The White category includes the following groups: White, Other (Specified), Not Stated, and Unknown. The White race/ethnic group is also non-Hispanic. The Black category only includes non-Hispanic Blacks. The Asian/Other category includes the following groups: Aleut, American Indian, Asian Indian, Asian (specified/unspecified), Cambodian, Chinese, Eskimo, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Pacific Islander, Samoan, Thai, and Vietnamese. The Asian/Other race/ethnic group is also non-Hispanic. This composition is somewhat different from the Asian/Pacific Islander category specified by United States Public Health Services (USPHS) in *Healthy People 2010*, primarily because of inclusion of Aleut, American Indian, and Eskimo groups. The Hispanic ethnic group includes any race, but is made up primarily of the White race.

Nativity (Tables 21-23B): The natality data were obtained from the Birth Statistical Master Files from 1998 through 2000. Records with unknown birthweight were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 21. Also, records with unknown prenatal care were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 23A, and records with unknown adequacy of prenatal care were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 23B.

Low birthweight has been associated with negative birth outcomes, and as an indicator of access problems and/or need for prenatal care services. Prevalence of low birthweight is defined as the percentage of live births weighing less than 2,500 grams (approximately 5.5 pounds). Birth rates to adolescents are also an indicator for other high-risk pregnancy factors. It is defined as the number of births to mothers 15-19 years of age per 1,000 female population 15-19 years of age.

The prenatal care indicator, Month Prenatal Care Began, has been associated with access to care. Late prenatal care is defined as the percentage of mothers who did not begin prenatal care in the first trimester. However, the percentage of births in which the mother's prenatal care began in the first trimester, as a health indicator, does not readily permit an unambiguous interpretation. According to some researchers, it fails to document whether or not prenatal care actually continues for the course of the pregnancy. Therefore, in addition to Prenatal Care Not Begun First Trimester of Pregnancy, this *Profiles* includes adequacy of prenatal care based on the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index.

In *Profiles* reports published in 1995 through 1998, the Kessner Index was used to measure the adequacy of prenatal care. The Kessner Index was replaced in the 1999 report by the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index, which is the methodology specified in *Healthy People 2010 Objectives*. The Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index developed by Milton Kottelchuck attempts to characterize prenatal care utilization on two independent and distinctive dimensions: Adequacy of Initiation of Prenatal Care and Adequacy of Received Services (once prenatal care has begun). The initial dimension, Adequacy of Initiation of Prenatal Care, characterizes the adequacy of the timing of

initiation of care (month prenatal care began). The second dimension, Adequacy of Received Services, characterizes the adequacy of prenatal care visits (number of visits) received during the time the mother is actually in prenatal care (from initiation until the delivery). The adequacy of prenatal visits is based on the recommendations established by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. These two dimensions are then combined into a single summary prenatal care utilization index, which contains the following five adequacy of prenatal care categories:

- (1) Adequate Plus: Prenatal care begun by the fourth month and 110 percent or more of the recommended visits received.
- (2) Adequate: Prenatal care begun by the fourth month and 80 to 109 percent of the recommended visits received.
- (3) Intermediate: Prenatal care begun by the fourth month and 50 to 79 percent of the recommended visits received.
- (4) Inadequate: Prenatal care begun after the fourth month or less than 50 percent of the recommended visits received.
- (5) Missing Information: Unknown adequacy of prenatal care.

Only “adequate and adequate plus” prenatal care are used in Table 23B to measure the adequacy of prenatal care utilization. Also, please note the two-factor index does not assess the quality of the prenatal care that is delivered, but simply its utilization. For further information on the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index, see the *American Journal of Public Health* article by Kottelchuck listed in the bibliography.

Breastfeeding Initiation During Early Postpartum (Table 24): Extensive research, especially in recent years, demonstrates the diverse and compelling advantages to infants, mothers, families, and society from breastfeeding and the use of human milk for infant feeding. Breastfeeding provides advantages with regard to the general health, growth, and development of infants, while significantly decreasing their risk for a large number of acute and chronic diseases. There are also a number of studies that indicate possible health benefits for mothers such as less postpartum bleeding, rapid uterine involution, and reduced risk of ovarian cancer and post menopausal breast cancer. In addition to individual health benefits, breastfeeding provides significant social and economic benefits to the nation, including reduced health care costs and reduced employee absenteeism for care attributable to child illness.

The breastfeeding initiation data presented in this report were obtained from the Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program. The Newborn Screening Program collects feeding data from all mothers who gave birth in a California hospital, usually within 24 hours of birth.

County of residence was derived from the mother’s zip code. When the zip code was not collected, the county of the hospital where the birth occurred was substituted. Births that occurred outside of California, at home, or in-transit were not collected through this Program and are not represented in Table 24. These births, however, accounted for less than 1.0 percent of the total resident live births in California.

The feeding data captured by the Newborn Screening Program were compiled into the following four categories:

Breastfed: Exclusively breastfed.

(1) Combination: Both breastfed and formula fed.

(2) Non-Breastfed: Formula fed and other (e.g., line fed).

(3) Unknown: Feeding choice unknown at the time of hospital discharge.

The breastfeeding initiation data presented in Table 24 are a composite of both “breastfed” and “combination” fed births. Records that were of “unknown” feeding type were excluded from the analyses.

The infant feeding data collected on the Newborn Screening form reflect the intentions of the mother at that time, and no follow-up survey is conducted to validate the accuracy of the information after the mother is discharged from the hospital. Caution should also be taken when analyzing breastfeeding initiation data alone because breastfeeding duration is not taken into consideration. Examination of breastfeeding initiation data along with duration data is recommended to thoroughly measure the effects of breastfeeding. Since appropriate data are not currently available, breastfeeding duration data are not presented in this report.

Childhood Poverty (Table 25): Children under the age of 18 living in families at or below the poverty level define the category of the population under 18 below poverty. The percent of children under 18 in this category is an indicator of global risk factors that have implications for the accessibility to health services.

CRUDE RATES AND AGE-ADJUSTED RATES

The numerator data used to compute rates and percentages were three-year averages compiled by county of residence of the decedent for the mortality table that includes all causes of death; county of residence of the mother for birth data (including linked birth-death data for infant mortality); and county of occurrence for morbidity data, except for AIDS, which was compiled by county of residence. Three-year averages tend to reduce the year-to-year fluctuations and increase the stability of estimates of vital events compared to data from single years.

Mortality data for specific causes of death prior to 1999 cannot be combined with data from earlier years because of the change from the ICD-9 to ICD-10 for cause of death coding. Therefore, the numerator data used to compute rates for the mortality data presented in Tables 2 through 13 are two-year averages for 1999 and 2000 using the ICD-10. (See the “Mortality” section under “DATA DEFINITIONS” for further explanation.) In the *Profiles 2003* report, a three-year average will be used to combine data for years 1999, 2000, and 2001. Thereafter, three-year averages will be used as numerator data for specific causes of mortality in future *Profiles* reports.

An unstandardized rate (usually referred to as a “crude rate”) is obtained by dividing the total number of vital events (e.g., deaths) by the total population at risk, then multiplying by some convenient basis (e.g., 100,000). Subpopulations (such as counties) with varying age compositions can have highly disparate death rates, since the risk of dying is primarily a function of age. Therefore, counties with a large component of elderly tend to have a high death rate. Any unwanted effect of different age compositions among counties can

be removed from the county death rates by the process of "age-adjustment." By removing the effect of different age compositions, counties with age-adjusted rates are directly comparable with the Year 2010 National Objectives.

Age-adjusted death rates are hypothetical rates obtained by calculating age-specific rates for each county and multiplying these rates by proportions of the same age categories in a "standard population," then summing the apportioned specific rates to a county total. The "standard population" used in the age-adjusted death rates in this report is the 2000 United States Standard Million Population. The age-adjusted rates put all counties on the same footing with respect to the effect of age and permit direct comparisons among counties. It is important to understand that age-adjusted death rates should be viewed as constructs or index numbers rather than as actual measures of the risk of mortality. Crude death rates, which include the effect of age, are the rates that should be applied when measuring the actual risk of dying in a specific population. For further information on age-adjusted rates, see the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) report by Curtin and Klein, "Direct Standardization", listed in the bibliography.

National objectives established for *Healthy People 2010* use the 2000 U.S. population for age adjusting rates. Therefore, the 2000 U.S. population was used as the "standard population" beginning with the 2001 *Profiles* report. The use of an agreed upon standard population permits direct comparison with both national data and the year 2010 objectives.

Readers should be cautioned that age-adjusted rates in *Profiles* reports from 1993 through 2000 used the 1940 Standard Population and cannot be compared with the age-adjusted rates in *Profiles* reports from 2001 forward. As an example, the 1999 age-adjusted death rate from all causes using the 2000 Standard Population for California was 773.8. If one were to use the 1940 Standard Population to create age-adjusted rates for the same California deaths in 1999, the age-adjusted rate would be 404.8. See Appendix A, at the end of these Technical Notes, for a comparison by county of 1999 age-adjusted death rates using the 1940 and 2000 Standard Populations.

Data for the morbidity tables were not age-adjusted due to the unavailability of data by age. Hence, only crude rates can be calculated. Although age and aging do affect morbidity, the effect is not as prominent as its effect on mortality.

Birth cohort infant death rates are also not age-adjusted. Since the deaths are linked to the births on a record-by-record basis, these rates are based on a numerator (deaths) and a denominator (births) from the same record. Age-adjusting is not applicable to these data.

Comparisons among counties reflect the actual risk of dying within the one year of birth in the cohort of births, and at the same time, are unaffected by confounding of different age compositions because the cohorts are all of the same age (under one year).

RELIABILITY OF RATES

All vital statistics rates, including morbidity rates, are subject to random variation. This variation is inversely related to the number of events (e.g., death) used to calculate the rate. The smaller the frequency of occurrence of an event, the greater the likelihood of random fluctuations within a specified time period. The more rare an event, the relatively less stable its occurrence from observation to observation. Even present day statewide

crude death rates may be interpreted as "rare" events occurring on the average of less than one death in 150 persons in the course of a year. (See Table 1: Deaths Due to All Causes, which shows 666.9 deaths per 100,000 population statewide.)

As a consequence, counties with only a few deaths, or a few cases of morbidity, can have highly unstable rates from year to year. The observation and enumeration of rare events is beset with uncertainty. The observation of no vital events is especially hazardous, regardless of the size of the population. This report reduces some year-to-year fluctuation in the occurrence of rare events by basing some rates on three-year average number of vital events (e.g., 1998-2000), divided by the population in the middle year (e.g. 1999). The "standard error" of a death rate and "coefficient of variation" (or relative standard error) provide a rational basis for determining which rates may be considered "unreliable." Although reliability of a rate is not either-or/on-off, in this report, counties with a relative standard error of greater than or equal to 23% of the rate or percent are marked with an asterisk (*). This criterion conforms to the standard used by the National Center for Health Statistics in determining the reliability cut-off for rates and percents. In addition, rates of zero, based on no events, are denoted with a plus sign (+), because the standard error cannot be calculated and is indeterminate. Furthermore, whenever the standard error is indeterminate, the confidence limits are not calculated, and a dash (-) denotes these confidence limits.

The 95% confidence limits depict the region within which (if data similar to the present set were independently acquired on 100 separate occasions) the rate would probably occur in 95 of those sets of data. In 5 of those 100 data sets, the rate or percent would fall outside the limits.

Finally, for appropriate statistical methodologies in comparing independent rates or percentages, please see the NCHS reports listed in the bibliography by Curtin and Klein on "Direct Standardization" and by Kleinman on "Infant Mortality."

RANKING OF COUNTIES

Data on each health indicator, except adequacy of prenatal care (Table 23B) and incidence of breastfeeding (Table 24), are displayed with the counties in rank order by increasing rates or percentages (calculated to 15 decimal places); lower rates or percentages are near the top of the table and higher rates or percentages are near the bottom of the table. Data for adequacy of prenatal care and incidence of breastfeeding are displayed with the counties in rank order by decreasing percentages (calculated to 15 decimal places); higher percentages are near the top of the table and lower percentages are near the bottom of the table. For all health indicators, counties with identical rates or percentages are ranked by size of population, with larger counties ahead of smaller counties.

PROCEDURE FOR CALCULATING AGE-ADJUSTED RATES BY THE DIRECT METHOD

Age-adjusted rates calculated in this report follow the procedure that was used to set the Year 2010 National Objectives. The standard population was the year 2000 United States population. The data below were taken from Table 1: Deaths Due to All Causes, 1998-2000 for Alameda County.

ALAMEDA COUNTY					
AGE GROUPS	1998-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	1999 POPULATION	AGE-SPECIFIC RATE/100,000	2000 U.S. STANDARD MILLION PROPORTIONS	WEIGHTED RATE FACTORS
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
TOTAL	9,835.0	1,448,643	678.9		
Unknown	1.67				
<1	106.0	21471	493.7	0.013818	6.8
1-4	19.0	87535	21.7	0.055317	1.2
5-14	26.0	215838	12.0	0.145565	1.8
15-24	115.3	176195	65.5	0.138646	9.1
25-34	195.7	215937	90.6	0.135573	12.3
35-44	425.3	258350	164.6	0.162613	26.8
45-54	778.7	205374	379.1	0.134834	51.1
55-64	1,021.3	117928	866.1	0.087247	75.6
65-74	1,745.7	78644	2,219.7	0.066037	146.6
75-84	2,776.3	52713	5,266.9	0.044842	236.2
>84	2,624.0	18658	14,063.7	0.015508	218.1
GE-ADJUSTED RATE-----					785.5

- STEP 1:** Array the data of three-year average number of deaths and population for 11 age groups in columns A and B.
- STEP 2:** Calculate age-specific rates by dividing the number of deaths in column A (numerator) by the population in column B (denominator). Multiply the result (quotient) by the base of 100,000 to obtain the rates in column C.
- STEP 3:** Multiply each age-specific rate in column C by the corresponding 2000 U.S. Standard Million proportion in column D and enter the result in column E.
- STEP 4:** The values for each age group in column E are summed to obtain the Age-Adjusted Death Rate for Alameda County of 785.5 per 100,000 population.
- STEP 5:** Repeat Steps 1 through 4 for each county and the statewide total. Note that the 2000 U.S. Standard Million proportions remain the same for each county and the state.
- STEP 6:** Direct comparisons can now be made among the counties, with the removal of the effect that varying county age compositions may have on death rates.

FORMULAS USED IN THIS REPORT

$$CDR = \left(\frac{nD}{Npop} \right) \times B$$

$$ADR = \sum W_a \left(\frac{nD_a}{Npop_a} \right) \times B$$

$$ASDR = \left(\frac{nD_a}{Npop_a} \right) \times B$$

$$SE_x = \left(\frac{CDR}{\sqrt{nD}} \right)$$

$$SE_y = \sqrt{\sum \frac{(W_a \times ASDR)^2}{nD_a}}$$

$$RSE_x = \left(\frac{SE_x}{CDR} \right) \times 100$$

$$RSE_y = \left(\frac{SE_y}{ADR} \right) \times 100$$

$$\text{Lower 95\% CL} = ADR - (1.96 \times SE_y) \quad \text{Upper 95\% CL} = ADR + (1.96 \times SE_y)$$

Where:

- CDR = Crude Death Rate
- ADR = Age-Adjusted Death Rate
- ASDR = Age-Specific Death Rate
- nD = Number of Deaths
- Npop = Population Size
- nD_a = Number of Deaths in an Age Group
- Npop_a = Population Size in Same Age Group
- B = Base (100,000)
- W_a = Age-Specific Weight (Standard Population Proportion)
- SE_x = Standard Error of a Crude Death Rate
- RSE_x = Relative Standard Error of a Crude Death Rate
- SE_y = Standard Error of an Age-Adjusted Death Rate
- RSE_y = Relative Standard Error of an Age-Adjusted Death Rate
- CL = Confidence Limit

**COMPARISON OF 1940 AND 2000 STANDARD POPULATION AGE-ADJUSTED RATES
DEATHS DUE TO ALL CAUSES
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2000**

COUNTY	1999 POPULATION	1998-2000 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	YEAR 2000 AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	YEAR 1940 AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA	34,072,478	227,232.0	666.9	773.8	404.8
ALAMEDA	1,448,643	9,835.0	678.9	785.5	412.3
ALPINE	1,226	7.0	571.0 *	657.2 *	356.6 *
AMADOR	34,410	355.3	1,032.6	716.9	392.3
BUTTE	204,216	2,130.3	1,043.2	779.7	439.5
CALAVERAS	40,597	394.0	970.5	724.0	412.5
COLUSA	20,091	146.0	726.7	725.4	425.7
CONTRA COSTA	921,662	6,625.3	718.8	769.8	388.9
DEL NORTE	30,358	255.0	840.0	776.2	468.6
EL DORADO	156,996	1,109.3	706.6	724.7	373.2
FRESNO	800,121	5,414.0	676.6	814.6	442.3
GLENN	28,438	239.7	842.8	798.6	444.2
HUMBOLDT	127,658	1,179.3	923.8	925.7	509.9
IMPERIAL	150,381	849.7	565.0	699.6	415.4
INYO	18,348	198.3	1,081.0	734.3	391.2
KERN	662,472	4,633.3	699.4	836.0	472.7
KINGS	123,683	718.7	581.1	873.3	478.2
LAKE	58,335	745.3	1,277.7	856.5	521.7
LASSEN	35,208	200.0	568.1	648.6	359.8
LOS ANGELES	9,727,841	59,189.7	608.5	769.1	404.3
MADERA	121,779	854.7	701.8	755.9	421.8
MARIN	247,073	1,827.0	739.5	727.6	343.2
MARIPOSA	16,339	170.3	1,042.5	736.6	446.3
MENDOCINO	88,978	798.0	896.9	839.6	454.1
MERCED	210,707	1,352.0	641.6	852.2	465.7
MODOC	10,384	104.3	1,004.8	750.6	402.4
MONO	10,730	39.3	366.6	474.7 *	266.1 *
MONTEREY	395,133	2,336.0	591.2	737.7	381.5
NAPA	125,123	1,264.0	1,010.2	788.9	392.9
NEVADA	94,014	860.7	915.5	655.5	341.3
ORANGE	2,787,593	16,432.3	589.5	785.8	371.8
PLACER	233,836	1,783.0	762.5	795.0	392.3
PLUMAS	20,714	211.0	1,018.6	743.4	428.0
RIVERSIDE	1,519,469	11,948.7	786.4	776.2	432.7
SACRAMENTO	1,189,056	8,925.0	750.6	867.0	459.0
SAN BENITO	50,087	275.3	549.7	636.1	327.5
SAN BERNARDINO	1,688,984	10,889.3	644.7	906.4	488.2
SAN DIEGO	2,884,572	19,185.3	665.1	769.3	398.9
SAN FRANCISCO	788,975	6,587.3	834.9	698.4	389.5
SAN JOAQUIN	566,793	4,245.0	749.0	818.8	458.1
SAN LUIS OBISPO	247,880	1,997.3	805.8	709.9	370.5
SAN MATEO	735,381	4,873.3	662.7	662.5	329.8
SANTA BARBARA	408,292	2,913.3	713.5	717.2	361.5
SANTA CLARA	1,732,034	8,937.3	516.0	696.9	332.6
SANTA CRUZ	255,825	1,663.7	650.3	692.5	349.3
SHASTA	171,211	1,681.0	981.8	887.4	475.9
SIERRA	3,427	34.3	1,001.8	624.4 *	326.4 *
SISKIYOU	44,847	465.3	1,037.6	817.3	449.3
SOLANO	392,201	2,431.7	620.0	866.7	446.3
SONOMA	450,187	3,753.3	833.7	777.8	399.4
STANISLAUS	446,056	3,380.3	757.8	880.0	479.8
SUTTER	79,992	658.0	822.6	807.7	445.1
TEHAMA	55,806	606.3	1,086.5	863.6	490.1
TRINITY	13,353	144.7	1,083.4	896.1	517.7
TULARE	371,640	2,579.7	694.1	818.8	460.6
TUOLUMNE	54,631	565.3	1,034.8	791.2	425.6
VENTURA	744,825	4,643.3	623.4	755.7	371.2
YOLO	160,805	1,046.3	650.7	811.9	424.0
YUBA	63,062	543.3	861.6	1,045.2	612.7

Note: * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23%.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Academy of Pediatrics. Breastfeeding and the Use of Human Milk (RE9729). *Pediatrics*, Vol. 100, No. 6, December 1997: pp. 1035-1039.

Armitage P, Berry G. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, second edition. Boston: Blackwell Scientific Publication, 1987.

Curtin LR, Klein RJ. Direct Standardization (Age-Adjusted Death Rates), *Healthy People 2000 Statistical Notes*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 95-1237, March 1995; No. 6-Revised.

Fleiss JL. *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions*, second edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1981.

Foster JE. Using Natality Data in Health Planning. *Statistical Notes for Health Planners*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 81-1237, November 1980; No. 12.

Freedman MA. Health Status Indicators for the Year 2000. *Healthy People 2000 Statistical Notes*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 92-1237, Fall 1991; Vol. 1, No. 1.

Institute for Medicine. *The Future of Public Health*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Science Press, 1988; pp. 13-15.

Klein RJ, Schoenborn, CA. *Healthy People 2010 Statistical Notes: Age Adjustment Using the 2000 Projected U.S. Population*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Publication, Number 20, January 2001.

Kleinman JC. Mortality. *Statistical Notes for Health Planners*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (HRA) 77-1237, February 1977; No. 3.

Kottlechtuck M. An Evaluation of the Kessner Adequacy of Prenatal Care Index and a 7Proposed Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index. *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 84, No. 9, September 1994: pp. 1414-1420.

Lilienfeld AM, Lilienfeld DE. *Foundations of Epidemiology*, second edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Tashiro M. A Description of the California Birth Cohort Perinatal File. *Data Matters* #83-11078. Center for Health Statistics, California Department of Health Services, February 1984.

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2000: National Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Objectives for the Nation*. Washington, D.C.: Public Health Service, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 91-50212, 1991.

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2010 Objectives (Conference Edition, in Two Volumes)*. Washington, D.C., January 2000.

World Health Organization. *Manual of the International Classification of Diseases, Injuries, and Causes of Death*, tenth revision. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1992.

TO ORDER ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES

Additional Copies, at \$10.00 per copy, of the 2002 report may be ordered from:

California Department of Health Services
Center for Health Statistics
304 S Street, 3rd Floor
P. O. Box 942732
Sacramento, CA 94234-7320
Telephone (916) 445-6355
FAX (916) 324-5599

Make checks payable to: Department of Health Services. Prior year reports from 1993 through 2001 may also be ordered, as long as the supply lasts. Please call or contact the Center for Health Statistics before placing an order for back issues to determine availability.

Number of Copies	Total Remittance
_____ 2002 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 2001 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 2000 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1999 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1998 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1997 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1996 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1995 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1994 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1993 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
Total: \$ _____ . _____	

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

P. O. Box: _____

City, State & Zip: _____

Telephone: (____) _____ - _____

TO ORDER ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES

Additional Copies, at \$10.00 per copy, of the 2002 report may be ordered from:

California Department of Health Services
Center for Health Statistics
304 S Street, 3rd Floor
P. O. Box 942732
Sacramento, CA 94234-7320
Telephone (916) 445-6355
FAX (916) 324-5599

Make checks payable to: Department of Health Services. Prior year reports from 1993 through 2001 may also be ordered, as long as the supply lasts. Please call or contact the Center for Health Statistics before placing an order for back issues to determine availability.

Number of Copies	Total Remittance
_____ 2002 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 2001 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 2000 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1999 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1998 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1997 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1996 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1995 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1994 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
_____ 1993 County Health Status Profiles @ \$10.00/copy:	\$ _____ . _____
Total: \$ _____ . _____	

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

P. O. Box: _____

City, State & Zip: _____

Telephone: (____) _____ - _____




















Publications, Reports, Catalog and Order Forms

- [HISP Home Page](#)
- [Center for Health Statistics \(CHS\)](#)
- [How to order Birth / Death certificates](#)
- [Vital Records Fee](#)
- [Office of Vital Records \(OVR\)](#)
- [Directory of Local Registrars](#)
- [Forms](#)
- [OVR Comments](#)
- [Office of Health Information and Research \(OHIR\)](#)
- [Vital Statistics Query System](#)
- [Vital Statistics Data Tables](#)
- [Population](#)
- [Publications](#)
- [Data Products](#)
- [OHIR Comments](#)

Availability of the Reports

Major Reports	Available on line		Published Report
Vital Statistics of California, 1998 (prior years also available)	Data Tables (Excel and Acrobat)		\$ 20
Health Data Summaries for California Counties, 2000 (prior years also available)	Hard copy only		\$ 20
Additional Reports	Word Format	Acrobat (pdf) Format	Published Report
Advance Report: California Vital Statistics, 1999 (prior years also available; 2000 is coming soon)			\$ 10
County Health Status Profiles, 2001 (prior years also available)	-		\$ 10
Leading Cause of Death Series (These reports present single or multiple years of data on a single cause of death such as heart disease or cancer.)	Click here for a list of reports available in Word and Acrobat formats		\$ 1 each
Leading Health Indicators for California, 1997			\$ 10
Analysis of Health Indicators for California's Minority Population, 1994	Hard copy only		\$ 10
California's Infant Death Rate, 1999			\$ 1
California's Infant Death Rate, 1998			\$ 1
Premature Mortality in California, 1997			\$ 1
Life Expectancy Reports: Abridged Life Tables for California 1990-96			\$ 5

Life Expectancy Reports: Abridged Life Tables by Race/Ethnicity for California 1995-97			\$ 5
Abridged Life Tables for California, 1997-1999	-		\$5
Multiple Cause of Death in California, 1995			\$5
Differences in Death Rates among California's Race/Ethnic Population, 1996	-		\$1
Premature Mortality in California, 1998 (prior years are also available)	-		\$1
Data Matters (complete list of topics available on request and in catalog)	Hard copy only for most reports		\$ 5
Zip Code Data Tables (Excel Format with Introduction in Word)			
Birth Profiles by Zip Code, California, 1989-2000 and Explanation			\$ 5 per year/copy
Death Profiles by Zip Code, California, 1989-2000 and Explanation			\$ 5 per year/copy
Catalog			
Catalog of Data Products and Publications			
ORDER FORMS			
Vital Statistics Data Files on CD-ROM			
Vital Statistics Mainframe Data Files			
Publications			
PC Products			
To order any of these products, please download and print appropriate order form, fill that out completely and mail the form (either in Word or Adobe Acrobat format) along with your check or money order to the address below. For more information, please contact the Vital Statistics Section at (916) 445-6355 or write to:			
Department of Health Services Office of Health Information and Research 304 S Street, 3rd Floor Sacramento, California 95814 ATTENTION: Jan Christensen (Updated 2/25/2002)			
If you need a certified copy of a birth or death certificate, or if you have questions about certificates, please click here or call (916) 445-1719.			

